United Nations S/PV.3477

Security Council

Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3477th Meeting

Thursday, 8 December 1994, 3.45 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	Djibouti	Mr. Olhaye
	France	Mr. Mérimée
	New Zealand	Mr. van Bohemen
	Nigeria	Mr. Gambari
	Oman	Mr. Al-Sameen
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Spain	Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Angola

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) (S/1994/1376)

Letter dated 7 December 1994 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1395)

94-87397 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Angola

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) (S/1994/1376)

Letter dated 7 December 1994 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1395)

The President (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Angola in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

On behalf of the Council, I welcome the Minister for External Relations of Angola and invite him to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. De Moura (Angola) took a place at the Council table.

The President *(interpretation from French):* The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II), document S/1994/1376, and a letter dated 7 December 1994 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council, contained in document S/1994/1395. Members of the Council also have before them document S/1994/1396, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following other documents: S/1994/1391, letter dated 7 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Angola to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the text of a message dated 5 December 1994 from the President of the Republic of Angola addressed to the Secretary-General; and S/1994/1394, letter dated 7 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Mali to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, transmitting the text of a message from the President of the Republic of Mali addressed to the Secretary-General.

I now call on the first speaker, the Minister for External Relations of Angola, His Excellency Mr. Venâncio De Moura.

Mr. De Moura (Angola) (*spoke in Portuguese; English text furnished by the delegation*): I am particularly pleased to be able to address the Council at this time, when the situation in Angola is calm.

I would like to begin by congratulating you, Mr. President, on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Angola and on my own behalf, on your assumption this month of the presidency of this important body, which today is once again addressing the situation in Angola.

I wish to extend my congratulations to Ambassador Madeleine Albright on her arduous work last month.

I would also like to reiterate our appreciation for the efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, which culminated in the signing of the Lusaka Protocol for peace in Angola.

We wish particularly to highlight the performance of the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Maître Alioune Blondin Beye, whose diplomatic experience, wisdom and patience made possible the successful conclusion of the Lusaka negotiating process after 12 months of complex and difficult negotiations. Throughout the negotiating process, Maître Beye, endowed with the spirit of impartiality, firmness and abnegation necessary for the conclusion of the Lusaka Protocol, showed himself to be thoroughly knowledgeable about the situation in Africa and the idiosyncrasies of Angolans. We wish here to pay sincere homage to Maître Beye, who so well represented the Secretary-General and, implicitly, this Council, and we encourage him to

proceed with the same dynamism in the present phase of the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol.

We also express our appreciation to the Troika of observer States — Portugal, the Russian Federation and the United States of America — for their important contribution to the work of the Angolan parties and Maître Beye to reach a consensus in Lusaka.

Finally, I wish to convey the appreciation of the Angolan Government and people to the Government of Zambia, particularly to President Frederick Chiluba, for having hosted in their country for more than a year the peace negotiations for Angola and for having contributed discreetly but effectively to the success of the negotiating process.

The negotiating process aimed at restoring peace in Angola was long, difficult and complex, as we are all aware. If we look back, we will remember that there have been various attempts to solve the Angolan conflict peacefully. We need only refer to the meetings at Nakuru and Mombassa in Kenya, at Alvor in Portugal, at Gbagdolite in Zaire, at Bicesse in Portugal, at Namibe in Angola, at Addis Ababa in Ethiopia, at Abidjan in Côte d'Ivoire and, finally, at Lusaka in Zambia. Despite the efforts of the Government and of the international community, of which the Security Council is the representative, the Angolan people's desire to live in peace seems to be potentially fulfilled only now.

Since 20 November Angolans have been saying "No" to the continuation of a destructive war that has caused hundreds of thousands of deaths, has crippled thousands of persons, caused more than 3 million people to be displaced, created thousands of refugees and orphans and destroyed significant portions of the country's economic and social infrastructure.

My Government has constantly called the attention of the international community — and of the Security Council in particular — to the danger to the peace process of the attempts to impose unrealistic formulas that completely ignored the outcome of the elections, the Bicesse Accords and the Council's resolutions on the peace process.

Those attempts led the Security Council to impose for the first time in its history an arms and fuel embargo on a political-military organization and to threaten to impose further sanctions if that organization failed to demonstrate a willingness to negotiate. The impact of that measure was indeed positive, from our perspective, because it accelerated the negotiating process and forestalled further delaying tactics.

It was due to pressure from the Security Council that those who believe in war as an option to resolve political disputes were forced to follow the path of dialogue, which prevailed over the force of arms. Now we have a signed agreement, one that must be implemented and strictly complied with. We are here today, on behalf of our Government, to reaffirm this.

The Lusaka negotiations have just reaffirmed what the Government of Angola has always maintained — namely, that there was no military solution for the post-electoral crisis in Angola, that it was imperative to protect democracy and that a just solution had to be found, a solution that would have to take into account the results of the elections and lead to the creation of conditions for genuine national reconciliation. With that objective in mind, the Government of Angola demonstrated much flexibility and made many concessions. We agreed to negotiate, even though parts of our national territory were still illegally occupied. Furthermore, we agreed to expand UNITA's participation in the Government at all levels, under conditions of peace.

Those and other gestures of flexibility, witnessed by the Council, became important factors which speeded up the negotiating process that culminated on 20 November in the signing of the Lusaka Protocol between the Government and UNITA.

The Lusaka Protocol represents the beginning of a critical stage in the final resolution of the internal conflict in Angola, establishing as it does a unique opportunity to remove completely the danger of a return to war. It also paves the way to the normal operation of democratic institutions, free of armed political parties, as in any other democratic society in the civilized world.

It is important to emphasize that the Lusaka Protocol, more than being a commitment to the Angolan people and the international community, places upon us as Angolans a political, legal and moral duty to set aside, totally and once and for all, the language of armed confrontation in resolving our problems. The signing of the Lusaka Protocol also means compliance with the laws of Angola and with the country's democratic institutions on a basis of equality with all other political parties in a multiparty Angolan society.

Strict implementation of those principles will create the specific conditions necessary for a genuine national reconciliation and lead to political stability and economic recovery for our country. The Government of Angola is deeply committed to pursuing those objectives, and we want to believe that UNITA is also acting in the same spirit, particularly in terms of practical deeds.

The present phase of implementation of the Lusaka Protocol requires from the international community, and from the Security Council in particular, a firm and impartial stand, without losing sight of the fact that Angola and its Government are legitimate members of that community. Past experience demands our utmost vigilance if we are to avoid recurrence of the mistakes and irregularities that occurred in the past, such as the uncontrolled circulation of arms and ammunition which led to the building-up of huge arsenals by UNITA just inside our cities.

As President José Eduardo Dos Santos has stated:

> "The Government and the United Nations must this time around assume their responsibilities coherently and effectively and be in a position to prevent premeditated breaches and forcefully to re-establish the law in case of any violations of the peace agreements."

It is imperative for the international community to be prudent so that no new excuses are allowed under any circumstances to be used to hinder the strict implementation of the withdrawal, quartering, disarming and incorporation into the National Army of all UNITA troops, followed by the disbanding of any surplus forces.

A critical factor for the success of the peace process in Angola is the creation of specific conditions for the implementation of the agreements. To that end, we ask for the establishment of an adequate United Nations mechanism in Angola, particularly regarding the logistics and military forces of UNAVEM III, which should be effectively capable of strictly monitoring the cease-fire and the withdrawal, quartering, disarming and demobilization of UNITA's troops. The establishment of adequate logistics, temporary barracks, transportation and communications to cover this operation is extremely important for the successful implementation of the Lusaka Protocol.

We consider that the only way to encourage the demobilized troops to abandon war and to reintegrate them into civilian life will be the establishment of programmes of social reintegration. To this end, it is important for the international community to support, financially and otherwise, the Government of Angola which, together with the United Nations, will be facing a huge and complex task which it must strive to accomplish in implementing the Lusaka Protocol.

Though we are certain that the successful implementation of the Lusaka agreements will ultimately depend on strong political will and on the good faith of the signatories, it is also true that the United Nations has adequate means to discourage those who may wish to act contrarily, as demonstrated by the various resolutions adopted over the past two years by the Security Council.

The negotiation of the Angola peace process has been closely followed by the Council, which has devoted dozens of formal sessions and innumerable informal sessions to it. The Council has unanimously adopted 16 resolutions on this question. This in itself shows the Council's commitment, as well as the magnitude and complexity of the Angolan process. This action by the Security Council was taken to help the Angolan people find a way to end the war, and it will be satisfying to know that, from now on, the efforts of the Council will be directed towards helping the Angolans to maintain and consolidate the peace process and to reconstruct the country. In this process, the Governments represented here can also play a very important role, either bilaterally or multilaterally. In this context, the prompt deployment of the UNAVEM III forces will be an important contribution to the consolidation of peace and will prevent these hard-won agreements from being jeopardized or violated.

My Government is concerned by the fact that an excessive lag between the signing of the agreement, the entry into force of the cease-fire and the arrival of the first contingent of Blue Helmets, as provided for in today's draft resolution, might jeopardize the timetable for the implementation of the various phases of the agreement. UNAVEM III would become a reality in Angola only four to six months after the adoption of today's draft resolution.

As a result, we consider the deployment of United Nations observers in all zones of Angolan territory, above all in the most sensitive areas — including those still under the control of UNITA — to be urgent, so as to guarantee the effective implementation of the Lusaka Protocol. We emphasize that, despite UNAVEM II's mandate having been renewed until 8 February 1995, the

constitution, definition and deployment of the new peace mission, UNAVEM III — in which my Government opposes the inclusion of contingents from countries that have been directly or indirectly involved in the Angolan conflict — should take place before the end of this period, once the conditions for beginning its gradual deployment have been created on the ground.

Indeed, the cease-fire, since its *de jure* entry into force on 22 November, is a reality in Angola, generally speaking. The reinstallation of UNAVEM II observers in the cities of Huambo, Luena, Memongue, Saurimo and Uige confirms that fact. At the same time, the presence in the Angolan capital as of last Sunday of the UNITA delegation as part of the Joint Commission confers greater confidence in the success of the Angolan process.

The long and bloody conflict has left deep scars in the life of the Angolan people, many of which cannot be healed. We are aware, however, that only a spirit of great tolerance, free from resentment and acts of hatred or vengeance, will allow us to avoid new conflicts and guarantee the stability of the country. To this end, the Angolan Parliament recently approved a law granting amnesty for all crimes committed against the internal security of the State and other crimes related thereto committed in the context of the post-electoral military conflict.

This measure, along with the legal guarantees associated with it, will contribute greatly to the strengthening of mutual confidence. Consequently, the re-establishment of the State administration in the areas formerly occupied illegally and the normal functioning of State institutions at all levels will be an important guarantee of the protection and respect of the civil and political rights of all citizens.

The Republic of Angola, as it is a State ruled by law, will continue to see to it that all political forces, including UNITA, may freely conduct their activities in conformity with the Constitution and with the other laws in force in the country.

The humanitarian situation in my country remains precarious owing to the dramatic consequences of the war, despite the great efforts of the Government and of international humanitarian agencies.

Now that the war is over, major challenges face the Government in the social and humanitarian domain: the social reintegration of surplus UNITA troops to be demobilized, multifaceted support for millions of displaced persons and refugees returning to their homes, the reconstruction of basic infrastructures and disarming, among others. We hope to address these tasks with the continued support of the international community.

This operation is broad in scope, since it will not exclude the people of UNITA and of other political parties at all levels, to whom the Government will have to devote special attention in the context of genuine national reconciliation. Accordingly, we intend not to provide reasons for dissatisfaction and resentment that may constitute focal points for disorder. We believe that only by keeping these aspects in mind can we guarantee a definitive end to the war in Angola and the successful implementation of the hard-won peace accords.

The coming phase of the peace process requires redoubled efforts in order to mobilize financial resources which are a *sine qua non* for overcoming the difficulties we are facing now. Under the present circumstances, the Government is not able to assume this heavy burden alone. That is why the international community is called upon to provide its active contribution, similar to the way it did during the period of hostilities.

I wish to take this opportunity once again to thank the United Nations agencies, the Governments of the whole world and, in particular, the Governments represented here, and the non-governmental organizations, for the generous support granted to the needy Angolan people, and to praise all the personnel involved in the humanitarian assistance operations, often at the risk of their own lives.

Lusaka has turned for us a new and important page in the history of Angola and everything should be done to ensure that it does not meet the same fate as the previous peace proposals.

The Government will continue to act in good faith and will not cease its efforts until peace, stability and true democracy are a reality in Angola.

In conclusion, I must state once again my appreciation and that of my Government for the arduous and effective work carried out by the members of the Council on the question of the Angolan conflict, and particularly the efforts of those who strove hardest for the Angolan reality to be analysed with greater understanding and transparency.

I should also like to commend the members of the Council in their work in producing the draft resolution which is to be adopted today. We shall continue to rely on their wisdom until a definitive solution to the Angolan conflict is found.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Angola for the kind words addressed to the Council and to me.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Gambari (Nigeria): I should like to begin by giving a warm welcome to Mr. Venâncio De Moura, Foreign Minister of Angola, and thank him most sincerely for his very important statement to the Council.

The Angolan situation has recently recorded significant developments, the most important of which was the signing of the Lusaka Protocol which builds on the "Acordos de Paz". We welcome this development and hope that the parties to the Protocol will commit themselves fully and faithfully to implementing its provisions in the higher interests of national reconciliation, peace, security and the social and economic development of the country. As a country that has participated actively in encouraging the peaceful resolution of the Angolan conflict, Nigeria cannot but restate its delight and satisfaction at the conclusion of this Protocol which, in our opinion, represents a major confidence-building measure between the parties.

In this connection, my delegation commends most sincerely the excellent work accomplished by Ambassador Blondin Beye, Special Representative of the Secretary-General and chief military observer of UNAVEM II. In paying tribute to the United Nations for its tireless efforts in advancing the peace process in Angola, we wish also to place on record that the United Nations personnel have had to work under very difficult conditions, but we should like to urge that this United Nations presence be maintained and indeed enhanced because the signing of the Protocol represents an important first step in the process towards building a durable peace in Angola.

The draft resolution under consideration reflects the current state of play in Angola and anticipates a future role for the United Nations in post-conflict peace-building in the expectation that the current cease-fire will continue to hold throughout the country. My delegation considers, in this regard, the full deployment of UNAVEM II personnel to its original strength not only appropriate but also a visible manifestation of the United Nations intent to continue to lend its assistance as far as possible. The restoration of UNAVEM II to its original strength should, in our opinion, be commenced promptly and completed without much delay.

My delegation welcomes the commitment the two parties entered into under the Lusaka Protocol with respect to the establishment of a cease-fire; the withdrawal, quartering and demilitarization of all UNITA troops; the disarming of all civilians; the completion of the formation of the national army and the police; national reconciliation; and the conclusion of the electoral process. It is in that context that we anticipate that a UNAVEM III will be desirable to assist with the final stages of national reconciliation and the restoration of a durable peace in Angola. For that reason we believe that contingency planning and the necessary consultations with actual or potential troop-contributing countries should be intensified.

Meanwhile, my delegation supports the extension of the mandate of UNAVEM II to 8 February 1995. We also urge all parties in Angola to take all necessary measures to ensure the safety and security of all international personnel in Angola. Above all, my delegation strongly calls upon all concerned in Angola to seize this very important opportunity to achieve a durable peace in Angola. The people of Angola have waited too long for the establishment in their country of a lasting peace enabling them to resume and pursue the normal activities of life and to enjoy the benefits of the social and economic development of their country. They should not be disappointed any longer.

My delegation supports the draft resolution in document S/1994/1396, and will vote in its favour.

Mr. Olhaye (Djibouti): My delegation is very pleased to welcome to the Security Council the Minister for External Relations of Angola, Mr. Venâncio De Moura; I thank him deeply for his very important statement. Equally, we are delighted to see in our midst Maître Alouin Blondin Beye, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. We wish to express our deepest

appreciation to Maître Beye, who, throughout these protracted and most difficult negotiations, has demonstrated courage, rare wisdom, dedication and tenacity.

The historic agreement signed at Lusaka, Zambia, on 20 November 1994 between the Government of Angola and the União Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola (UNITA) evidences the encouraging developments that have taken place in Angola. We have read with great interest the report of the Secretary-General of 4 December on the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II), and his assessment of the situation in that country. Together with his letter dated 7 December 1994 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the report reinforces the feeling that the situation in Angola has turned the corner, and that there is a real desire on the part of everyone to complete the difficult journey to a cease-fire, peace, national reconciliation and stability. If that is indeed the case, the draft resolution before us, by which we would extend the mandate of UNAVEM II and expand the scope of United Nations assistance to Angola during its initial transition phase, deserves to be supported.

No doubt because we have travelled the peace-accord road in Angola before — twice before, in fact, the last time all the way to elections — some reservations are evident. Clearly, there is need for assurances that the fighting has indeed halted and that the cease-fire called for is taking hold. In addition, while, through his support staff and through communiqués, Mr. Savimbi has indicated his support for the Accord, there is little doubt that his physical presence and his approval in person are necessary to allay the lingering concerns harboured by his army and his supporters. Heavy fighting right up to the day of signing will, it is hoped, not compromise Mr. Savimbi's ability to convince his forces to lay down their arms and begin the actual process of national reconciliation. Undoubtedly, at this point they will take their cue from him, which makes it all the more imperative for him to step forward. There will be much to do in separating the forces and disarming them, in reconstituting the army and the government, and in completing the arrangements for the final phase of the 1992 election process.

Fortunately, by resolution 952 (1994) we have laid the ground for a sufficient United Nations presence in Angola during the initial peace phase to avoid some of the shortcomings that plagued our efforts in the last peace/elections phase. Given the obvious level of mistrust still existing between the two sides, the number of post-election questions raised concerning the last elections, and the lack of disarmament at that time, the Council must make certain that the Secretary-General and UNAVEM II have the manpower and support they require to monitor effectively the cease-fire process and the elections.

Nevertheless, we will all be guided by the political will demonstrated by the Angolans themselves. Only when there is evidence that the cease-fire is holding and that concrete steps are being taken towards national reconciliation can the international community be expected to undertake all the measures needed to assist the Angolans effectively. Without political will and good faith, the whole process remains precarious and unstable.

My delegation is relieved to note that humanitarian aid, though affected in some locations by heavy fighting, appears in general to be getting through. We can, we hope, avoid any major catastrophe of suffering until measures are taken by the Angolan Government to address the many problems and the destruction caused by the long civil war. Fortunately, the comprehensive de-mining programme for the country has become operational, and the information required is being collected.

As the Secretary-General notes, both sides must continue meticulously to implement the cease-fire on the ground, or the whole process could unravel again. Concrete confidence-building measures must be undertaken by both sides and by their leaders personally. Angola, together with the rest of southern Africa, has the potential for a good future, for it is a wealthy country in a promising area. Another false alarm would be dangerous at this time — a fact of which everyone is, no doubt, aware.

My delegation therefore fully supports the draft resolution before us. It has as its major objective the restoration of UNAVEM II to its original strength and the extension of its mandate for a further two-month period to provide the Secretary-General sufficient time both to determine the viability of the cease-fire and to put in place contingency planning for potential peace-keeping operations. We hope all will go well, and we wish the people of Angola a durable peace, stability and prosperity.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): It gives me pleasure to welcome the Minister for External Relations of the Republic of Angola, Mr. Venâncio De Moura, and to thank him for his important and interesting statement to the Security Council. We are also happy to see here the Special

Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Beye, who has made a great personal contribution to the establishment of the peace process in Angola and who continues to facilitate the positive process in that country.

Russia — which, in close cooperation with the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and our partners in the "troika" of observers, has made many efforts to bring about a successful Angolan settlement — was very pleased to learn of the signing of the Lusaka Protocol and the entry into force of the cease-fire. An important stage has been reached towards ending the fratricidal war in the long-suffering land of Angola and towards achieving national reconciliation. We sincerely congratulate the people of Angola on this momentous event. As President Yeltsin stated on the occasion of the signing of the Lusaka Protocol, that document embodies the triumph of political reason over the senselessness of casualties and destruction caused by war.

Moscow sincerely hopes that the mutual understanding between the Angolan parties achieved in Lusaka will grow during the implementation of the signed agreements into profound mutual trust. We are convinced that the establishment of lasting peace in Angola will become possible only as a result of strict compliance by both sides with the obligations accepted by them. Of particular importance here is strict observance by them of the cease-fire agreement. We also urgently appeal to the Government of Angola and particularly to UNITA to demonstrate due political will and, in particular, without delay to complete negotiations on military issues that have not yet been resolved in Lusaka — a matter of great importance for the success of the peace process.

The Russian delegation is sure that the Security Council will unanimously adopt this draft resolution to extend the mandate of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) until 8 February 1995. The draft resolution clearly guides the Government of Angola and UNITA towards constructive cooperation on the basis of the Bicesse agreements and the Lusaka Protocol. For its part, as is clear from the draft resolution, the United Nations is prepared to give Angola the necessary assistance in monitoring effective compliance with the cease-fire agreement.

In this connection, we attach great importance to the decision taken by the Secretary-General to start deploying additional United Nations personnel and speedily to restore the strength of UNAVEM II to its previous level.

The Russian delegation considers it important that the dispatch of United Nations personnel to Angola take place promptly, with the immediate deployment of observer posts *in situ*. We believe that this would be an important step towards strengthening the climate of trust, the lack of which is still so palpable in Angola, and that this step will have a restraining effect on both the Angolan parties and will reduce the likelihood of mishaps occurring during the normalization of the situation. We expect that the Government of Angola and UNITA will take due steps to ensure the safety of international personnel and will provide appropriate guarantees to that effect.

An important aspect of the draft resolution is that it sends the Angolan parties a clear signal that the Security Council is prepared in the near future to move to a larger and more active role for the United Nations in promoting the successful development of the peace process, provided, of course, that the situation in Angola is favourable.

For its part, the Russian Federation will do all it can to promote that role, including by sending our military observers to Angola.

The President *(interpretation from French)*: I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document S/1994/1396.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Djibouti, France, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 966 (1994).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil): May I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for the month of December. We are fully confident that you will conduct our business in an effective and smooth way, and you may rest assured that

you can rely on my delegation's unconditional support and cooperation. I also wish to thank your competent predecessor, Mrs. Madeleine Albright, and her associates for a job well done during the busy month of November.

We have listened with great attention to the comprehensive statement just made by His Excellency Mr. Venâncio De Moura, Minister of External Relations of Angola. His clear and lucid intervention contributes to a better understanding of the very complex situation facing his country at this very crucial moment. His words constitute additional evidence of his Government's unequivocal commitment to working for the attainment of the dual objectives of peace and national reconciliation.

I wish also to express my Government's recognition of President José Eduardo dos Santos' unabated commitment to peace. The political wisdom and the leadership which he demonstrated at the head of his Government during the process that led to the signing of the Lusaka Protocol put him among the most eminent statesmen of his continent.

We are grateful also to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for his constant and energetic optimism, even in times when negotiations seemed to be heading towards a deadlock. His profound knowledge of the situation and his understanding of the complexities involved in the Angolan conflict made Maître Beye a pivotal figure in the negotiations. He deserves our full recognition.

Two decades of war in Angola have exacted a heavy toll on the civilian population and have brought about a humanitarian crisis of huge proportions. Brazilians are linked to Angolans by common historical, cultural and ancestral ties. We have a special, intense relationship that is bound to be further enhanced once that sister country finally enters the long-deserved path of peace, stability and economic and social development. These are among the main reasons why Brazil is following with the utmost interest the evolution of the political process in Angola.

The Government of Brazil is highly encouraged by the signing of the Lusaka Protocol. This document represents a window of opportunity for the restoration of lasting peace through national reconciliation. During the course of this long-protracted process, there were times when we were saddened by the tremendous human suffering of the Angolan people and the tragic toll the war had inflicted on that country for two decades. There were times when we were concerned that peace seemed too elusive, almost an unreachable goal. There were times when we were frustrated by the sequence of events, with one small step forward in the direction of peace being followed by two steps backward in the direction of military confrontation, thus making the prospects for peace even more distant.

After the unfortunate breakdown of the Bicesse Accords, several meetings were convened in different cities, all of them to no immediate avail. These are, however, times for hope and optimism, and we are confident that the recent series of events firmly points in the direction of a new chapter in the history of Angola. Since the signing of the Protocol in the Zambian capital, the agreed cease-fire has been observed without major incidents. There have been public pledges by both sides towards the objective of peace and national reconciliation. The scheduled meetings of the Joint Commission have taken place in Luanda, and they are emblematic of the new times. There are reports of a planned meeting between President José Eduardo dos Santos and Mr. Jonas Savimbi.

The Lusaka Protocol completes a long and strenuous cycle that began last year, when UNITA started to accept the validity of the "Acordos de Paz" and, in particular, the validity of the 1992 elections, held under United Nations supervision. The resolution we have just adopted is far from being a "business as usual" type of decision. It reflects the strong desire of the members of the Council and of the international community in general for the United Nations to continue to contribute to the peace process in Angola at this very crucial juncture.

We have not merely technically extended the mandate of UNAVEM II for two months. We are acknowledging the decision of the Secretary-General to proceed with the deployment of additional UNAVEM II personnel to its previous authorized level. We are setting the stage for an expanded United Nations presence in Angola for the post-Lusaka period.

Brazil has consistently defended an adequate United Nations presence in Angola to enhance the chances for peace and national reconciliation. We have been underscoring that United Nations peace-keeping operations are established and deployed in the name of the Organization as a whole and not of the Security Council alone. In this connection, two main doctrinal principles have guided the Brazilian delegation during our current tenure in this Council.

On the one hand, we have advocated that peace-keeping operations are aimed at contributing to alleviating tensions and promoting peace in regional conflicts that pose a threat to peace and stability. On the other hand, we have always defended the need to ensure the absolute impartiality of these operations if they are successfully to implement the mandates they have been entrusted with. These operations are a means to assist in the full implementation of agreements to which the parties have freely committed themselves.

The diplomatic efforts made by the United Nations since November last year have resulted in the signing of the Lusaka Protocol. The international community is now in duty bound to approve the expansion of the United Nations presence in Angola.

Lessons from the recent past have shown that in order for such an operation to be effective, it should be adequately staffed and equipped. Equally important is the fact that its approval and actual deployment should not be subject to undue delays. The international community cannot squander this unique opportunity to establish a lasting peace in Angola.

Peace in Angola crowns a successful trend, which started in South Africa and has just been advanced in Mozambique. However, some operations on other continents have not shown as yet the same positive results. Brazil has already indicated its willingness to commit military personnel required for the purpose of peace-keeping.

We encourage the Secretary-General to present, as promptly as possible, his recommendations for a possible mandate for a new United Nations operation in Angola. We urge this Council to consider without delay such recommendations when they become available. It is our sincere hope that the Secretary-General will make every effort to submit the required report in good time, before 8 February, so that the Security Council may take early action leading to the establishment and deployment of UNAVEM III. Any delay, I might add, entails a corresponding slippage in the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol, with all the undesirable risks involved.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Brazil for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Li Zhaoxing (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation would like to welcome the Minister for External Relations of Angola to this meeting and to thank him for his important statement. We would also like to welcome the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Mr. Beye.

The Chinese Government has been following closely the peace process in Angola and deeply sympathizes with the suffering experienced by the Angolan people in frequent wars. We therefore support the two Angolan parties in their efforts to end war and to achieve national reconciliation through negotiations. We are pleased to note that the Angolan Government and UNITA have, with the assistance of the United Nations and other parties, officially signed the Lusaka Protocol and agreed to a comprehensive cease-fire thereafter, which not only has brought hope for an end to the 19-year civil war, but is also of great significance to peace and stability in Southern Africa.

While significant progress has been made in the Angolan peace process, we also note that military clashes between the two Angolan parties still take place from time to time and that the humanitarian situation there remains grave. Should this situation continue, the successful implementation of the Lusaka Protocol would be jeopardized and the Angolan peace process could fall short of success for lack of a final effort. This is not what the international community would like to see.

Peace and stability is the foundation of national stability and people's well-being. The determination of both parties in Angola to lay down their arms and set out on the road to national reconciliation conforms to the long-term and fundamental interests of the Angolan people as well as to the common aspirations of the international community. But the practical implementation of the Protocol calls for continued strong political will on both sides, whose pressing task is immediately to stop all hostilities in order to create conditions for national reconciliation. We call on the leaders of both parties to meet at an early date to settle their remaining differences through dialogue and make their contributions to lasting peace and stability in Angola.

The resolution adopted today demonstrates the resolve of the Security Council to continue to support the Angolan peace process and the readiness of the international community to continue its efforts to help achieve national reconciliation and restore peace and stability in Angola at an early date, thus bringing it onto the track of reconstruction and economic recovery.

In this regard, the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) has done tremendous work and played an important role. The Chinese Government has been giving, and will continue to give, its full support. It is in this spirit that we voted in favour of the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Cárdenas (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me first to welcome the Minister for External Relations of Angola, Mr. Venâncio De Moura, at a time when the Council is reiterating its commitment and readiness to continue contributing to the peace process in his country.

At the same time, we commend the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative, the tireless Maître Beye, in this process. We are grateful for the comprehensive reports provided to us, which have been invaluable to us in our consideration of this item.

The developments in Angola since the Council last considered the situation are heartening, and we hope that the positive trends that are emerging will become established. In this context, we commend the Government of Angola and UNITA for the signing of the Lusaka Protocol on 20 November last, the entry into force of the cease-fire and the continuation of the peace process through the negotiations that began last Sunday in Luanda.

The people of Angola should have no doubts about the resolve of the international community to continue to support the peace process now under way. However, the parties must be aware that the readiness of the United Nations to expand its efforts in the country and devote more resources to it will largely depend on respect for, and compliance with, the Lusaka Protocol and any other agreements that may be reached.

At this early stage in the implementation of the peace process, my Government regards a United Nations presence in Angola as particularly important. We therefore supported the resolution that we have just adopted, extending the present mandate of UNAVEM II until 8 February next year, with immediate restoration of UNAVEM's strength to its previous level. This presence will help to guarantee the enforcement of the cease-fire, as well as strengthening the negotiations that are taking place in Luanda.

We hope that the peace process will be boosted by the Lusaka accords and that efforts to achieve national reconciliation will be stepped up so that the Security Council may give positive consideration to the report that the Secretary-General will present on a new mandate that would amount to a new United Nations operation in Angola.

My country contributes military police and observers to the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II), and it stresses the importance of the fullest respect at all times on the part of the Angolan Government and UNITA for the safety and protection of all international personnel in Angola. This will help to create confidence and will undoubtedly encourage the international community to continue to participate in Angola.

In this respect, I should like to say that my Government is actively considering the possibility of contributing a specialized contingent to an expanded United Nations presence in Angola. We are particularly gratified to see that the distribution of humanitarian assistance has become normalized throughout Angolan territory, and we applaud especially the dispatch of an inter-agency mission to Angola with a view to assessing the broad programme of humanitarian assistance, as well as the entry into force of the mine-clearance programme, since mines, together with other explosive devices, are causing many civilian victims.

After more than 20 years of struggle the Angolan people have suffered enough and deserve to live in peace. We have no doubt that the international community will be ready to support this undertaking by providing the necessary assistance and cooperation.

My Government wishes to express its gratitude to the three observer States to the Angolan peace process, the Organization of African Unity and neighbouring countries — in particular, Zambia — for their endeavours to ensure the full implementation of the peace agreements, the Lusaka Protocol and the relevant resolutions of the Security Council. We also express our warm gratitude to UNAVEM II and its personnel and to the various United Nations and non-governmental organizations for their constant and substantive contribution to the success of the process of peacemaking in Angola, which is now becoming a reality.

Sir David Hannay (United Kingdom): I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the office of President of the Security Council and to thank your predecessor, Ambassador

Albright, for the remarkable work that she did during the very highly charged month of November.

The signing of the Lusaka Protocol on 20 November and agreement on a cease-fire two days later are the most hopeful developments that have occurred in the last two years of the Angolan tragedy. As the Secretary-General has said in his report, Angola has now been brought to the threshold of peace. We commend the Government of Angola, whose distinguished Foreign Minister is amongst us this afternoon — and we welcome his presence very much — and UNITA for demonstrating the necessary political will, and we congratulate the Secretary-General, his Special Representative, who is also with us this afternoon, and the personnel of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) for their infinite patience and determination, which now appears to be bearing fruit. We are also most grateful to the Government of Zambia and to the three observer States to the Angolan peace process for their valuable contributions.

Although the Lusaka Protocol is an undoubted achievement, the position on the ground remains fragile. It is essential that the parties implement the agreement speedily and in good faith so that lasting peace and national reconciliation can be achieved in Angola. It is particularly important that they respect and maintain an effective cease-fire and take up any problems about cease-fire matters in the Joint Commission, not resorting to tit-for-tat retaliation.

The international community cannot be expected to enforce peace in Angola, and it will not be equipped to do so. So the deployment of a new, expanded United Nations operation will be possible only if the cease-fire remains effective and the parties demonstrate the necessary practical commitment to peace.

We welcome the preparatory work already undertaken by the Secretary-General for an expanded United Nations operation. We agree that any new force will need to be deployed quickly, and we hope that troop-contributing countries will be able to make their contingents available without delay. We look forward to the report that the Secretary-General intends to submit to the Council early next year.

In the meantime, we are pleased that he now intends to proceed with the deployment of the additional military observers and civilian police authorized under UNAVEM II. He has rightly made this dependent on the strict observance by the parties of the cease-fire and the provision by them of satisfactory guarantees for the safety and security of United Nations personnel. We hope that this deployment will contribute to a further reinforcement of the cease-fire.

It is now necessary for confidence to be built up between the Government of Angola and UNITA. This should be done through regular meetings of the Joint Commission to resolve any outstanding differences. A meeting between President Dos Santos and Mr. Savimbi should help to build up the necessary political momentum for successful implementation of the Lusaka Protocol. The prompt departure from Angola of all mercenaries, in accordance with the Lusaka Protocol, will also be an important measure to build confidence.

The humanitarian situation in Angola remains serious, but with the cessation of military activities it should now be possible for humanitarian assistance to reach more of the country. It is essential that the parties cooperate in the delivery of this assistance and that they ensure the safety and security of UNAVEM II and of all humanitarian personnel.

It is the Government of Angola and UNITA themselves who, by their observance of the agreement that they have now reached, will determine whether the United Nations and the international community will accompany them on this final phase of their long and difficult road to peace. We trust and hope that we shall all travel together along that road.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Mérimée (France) *(interpretation from French)*: Once more we have renewed the mandate of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) in its current form. My delegation voted in favour of resolution 966 (1994), which extended the mandate for a period of two months — until 8 February 1995.

We are happy that this was done in the presence of the Minister for External Relations of Angola, Mr. Venâncio De Moura, whom we welcome.

I said "Once more", but recent developments in Angola enable one to say that this extension of the mandate of UNAVEM II is different from previous extensions. Since the adoption of our previous resolution, on 27 October, very important events have taken place in Angola — primarily, of course, the initialling on 31

October and, in particular, the signing on 20 November of the Lusaka Protocol by the Government of Angola and UNITA. This very important, detailed agreement, which took a long time to negotiate, should make an important contribution to the establishment of lasting peace in Angola, as well as to national reconciliation.

The meeting in Luanda of the Joint Commission that is to monitor the implementation of the Lusaka Protocol is also an encouraging sign.

To sum up, since the signing of the Lusaka Protocol a lasting political settlement of the Angolan conflict seems to be attainable. It is just as necessary to put an end to the 19 years of war in Angola, during which the civilian population has suffered most.

For this encouraging progress towards peace in Angola my delegation wishes to thank and offer heartfelt congratulations to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Maître Blondin Beye, whose persistence, accompanied and supported by his unflagging enthusiasm, has had a great impact on the events of recent weeks. We should also like to congratulate the three observer States for their work, as well as the other participants in the peace process in Angola.

The United Nations must forge ahead in Angola and accompany the Angolan people in its quest for peace and national harmony. In this respect, we welcome the Secretary-General's decision to deploy UNAVEM II personnel on Angolan territory if conditions make it possible to do so. In this connection, the Secretary-General quite rightly recalled in his report an idea that is reflected in the resolution we have just adopted — namely, that the Angolans were the principal architects of peace in Angola. This means in particular that the Angolan parties should strive fully, resolutely and definitively to comply with the cease-fire agreed to on 22 November. This tangible sign of their commitment to peace has always been the condition on which the deployment of United Nations personnel is based. The parties should remember this in their future efforts to pursue and consolidate the cessation of hostilities and compliance with the cease-fire.

The two months given UNAVEM II will no doubt be a time of intensive activity on the ground in Angola in the quest for the attainment of the goals I have mentioned and of all the goals set forth in the resolution. Within the United Nations it will be a time for deep reflection on the possible future mandate of a new United Nations operation in Angola. In this context, towards the end of January my delegation will be awaiting the Secretary-General's recommendations, which it will of course study with the keenest attention.

Not so long ago peace in Angola seemed a hard-to-reach objective, but recent developments have brought its attainment closer. It is now up to the Angolan parties, which are so close to the attainment of their goal, to make the necessary efforts to complete the process of peace and national reconciliation for the sake of their own country.

Mr. Al Sameen (Oman) (*interpretation from Arabic*): At the outset, allow me to bid a warm welcome on behalf of my delegation, through you, Mr. President, to His Excellency the Minister for External Relations of Angola and to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General. It is an honour to have them here with us today.

There has been an important positive development recently in the situation in Angola that we had long waited for. After long and arduous negotiations, the Lusaka peace talks between the Angolan Government and the União Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola (UNITA) culminated in the formal signing of the Lusaka Protocol, which formally put an end to the civil war that raged in Angola for two decades, claimed thousands of lives and caused widespread destruction of property.

My delegation welcomes the successful conclusion of the peace talks and the signing of that important document, which, together with the Bicesse Accords, should lay the foundations of lasting peace in Angola.

This major achievement was made possible by the international community's support for the peace process in Angola. It reflects the Government's and UNITA's determination to attain peace in Angola and embodies the Angolan people's desire to live in peace and harmony. We congratulate the Angolan people on these remarkable successes, and salute the political leaders of both the Government and UNITA for their patience in overcoming all the obstacles in the various stages of the peace negotiations and for not wasting the opportunity to restore peace in their country.

My delegation sincerely hopes that both parties will continue to demonstrate their commitment to peace and national reconciliation through full and timely compliance with both the letter and the spirit of the peace accord,

particularly the provisions relating to the cease-fire agreement.

In this context, my delegation notes that even with the signing of the Lusaka Protocol and the entry into force of the cease-fire agreement on 22 November, occasional clashes between Government and UNITA forces still occur. Perhaps, this is because feelings of enmity and hatred have become ingrained and the lack of trust between the parties cannot be remedied overnight. We hope that such negative feelings will gradually disappear and be replaced by a spirit of cooperation, tolerance and harmony amongst all the people of Angola. Although such incidents cannot diminish the value of the recent successes, it is clear that unless the two parties halt the aggravation and prevent the recurrence of such incidents, the entire peace process may be at risk. Therefore, both parties are called upon, now more than ever before, to renounce violence, to put an end to all military operations, to exercise the utmost self-restraint and to refrain from any action that could jeopardize the newborn peace. The gains that have been made are very fragile and can easily collapse under the onslaught of any escalation in the fighting or because of any wavering of international support for peace in Angola.

Proceeding from these considerations, my delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted by the Council, through which it has renewed the mandate of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) through 8 February 1995 in order to enable it to oversee and monitor the cease-fire provided for in the Lusaka Protocol.

In conclusion, I should like to express my delegation's appreciation to the Secretary-General, his Special Representative in Angola and the three observer States to the Angolan Peace Process, especially Zambia, which hosted the peace negotiations, for their important and effective contributions to finding a just and durable solution to the conflict in Angola, and we are pleased to note that their concerted efforts have borne fruit.

Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Allow me first of all to express our pleasure at seeing you, Sir, presiding over the work of the Council. We wish to assure you of the Spanish delegation's full cooperation.

I also wish to convey my delegation's esteem and gratitude to Ambassador Albright of the United States for the highly competent and effective manner in which she performed her duties as President of the Council in November.

My delegation would also like to extend a welcome to the Minister for External Relations of Angola, Mr. Venâncio De Moura, and congratulate him on the leading role he has played in a historic period of Angola's history, the signing of the Lusaka Protocol.

The resolution the Security Council has just adopted extends the mandate of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) until 8 February 1995. That extension cannot be regarded as merely technical in nature, for the culmination of the Lusaka talks between the Government of Angola and UNITA means that this particular resolution has a special political significance in setting the course of the peace process. This was due, in the first place, to the will demonstrated by the parties, with the effective assistance of the Secretary-General and of his Special Representative, Mr. Blondin Beye, of the observer States and of other countries in the region. We pay tribute to them all for their endeavours and for the results achieved.

The signing of the Lusaka Protocol between the Government of Angola and UNITA on 20 November 1994 and the cease-fire agreement between the parties has paved the way for the Security Council's being able to give, in the near future, serious consideration — if circumstances warrant — to the question of deciding on an expanded United Nations presence in Angola, which would be in harmony with what was agreed by the parties at Lusaka and in response to their request to us. To that end, it is vital that the parties comply with the commitments undertaken in the "Acordos de Paz" and the Lusaka Protocol and to continue to work together to achieve full national reconciliation.

We welcome the fact that the Joint Commission established at Lusaka has begun its work on Angolan soil, thereby establishing a climate of confidence and mutual respect that should prevail and bear fruit in this new phase.

The Secretary-General's report of 4 December and his letter of 7 December communicating to the Council his decision to proceed to restore the strength of UNAVEM II to its previous level, as well as the very useful information conveyed orally to the Council by his Special Representative, Mr. Blondin Beye, confirm the need to give further impetus to the peace process and ensure international verification, with all due care being

taken but with the vital determination to pursue the process.

Despite a number of skirmishes and other initial difficulties, according to the Secretary-General and his Special Representative the cease-fire agreed to by the parties has been holding, in essence, since 22 November.

Given those circumstances, it is vital to restore the strength of UNAVEM II as early as possible in order to ensure effective monitoring of the cease-fire and as a first step towards confidence-building. As the Secretary-General informs us in his letter, the redeployment of such personnel depends on strict observance of the cease-fire and satisfactory guarantees from both sides regarding the safety and security of the United Nations personnel concerned.

Spain, which is bound to Angola by close ties of friendship and cooperation, firmly hopes that the international community's commitment to the peace process in its new phase will soon be confirmed by the establishment of a new United Nations operation in Angola that will make a decisive contribution to the fulfilment of the "Acordos de Paz" and the Lusaka Protocol.

We welcome the fact that the parties are demonstrating a firm resolve to put this commitment into practical effect. It is now time to look forward to the future and achieve reconciliation and reconstruction in the country while paving the way for the lasting peace and prosperity the Angolan people so richly deserve after so many years of war.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Spain for his kinds words addressed to me.

Mr. Inderfurth (United States of America): Let me congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. I can attest that Ambassador Albright is most happy to be able to pass the reins of the presidency into your hands. We are sure you will meet the challenges of your office admirably, and you can count on our full support and assistance in this regard.

We owe thanks to Maître Blondin Beye, the Secretary-General's Special Representative, for his unflagging efforts, energy and dedication to the cause of helping Angola move towards lasting peace. I know that he has worked in close concert with the three observer States, including our own Special Envoy to Lusaka, Ambassador Paul Hare, to achieve the goals we all shared.

I would also like to welcome the Minister for External Relations of Angola and express the hope that his Government and the Council will be able to continue to mark positive developments in Angola.

It is with great pleasure that we are able through this resolution finally to welcome the signing of the Lusaka Protocol. This agreement was a long time in coming and marks a significant step towards the national reconciliation that the international community has actively promoted over the past several years. We expect that all provisions of the Lusaka Protocol will be scrupulously adhered to by both parties.

While we are encouraged by the announcement of a cease-fire beginning 22 November, we would like to express our concern over continued allegations of cease-fire violations by both parties. The resolution just adopted stresses the importance of both parties' fully respecting the cease-fire.

It is important that President Dos Santos and Mr. Savimbi personally make every effort to arrange for a one-on-one meeting at the earliest possible movement in order to move the peace process forward with all due speed.

In closing, let me once again join my colleagues on the Council who have expressed great satisfaction with this major step forward towards lasting peace in Angola. The journey is not yet complete, but the path ahead is clear.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. van Bohemen (New Zealand): We thank the Minister for External Relations of Angola for his important statement. We also value the presence here today of Ambassador Blondin Beye, the Secretary-General's Special Representative.

For well over a year the two parties in Angola have been coaxed and cajoled by the Council, and more particularly by the Secretary-General's Special Representative, to pursue negotiations for a peaceful resolution of their differences and an end to the tragic civil war in Angola. Progress has been slow, and the setbacks not infrequent. This has been disappointing — disturbingly so when the negotiations have been

paralleled by outbreaks of serious fighting with disastrous consequences for the Angolan population.

It has also to be acknowledged that the fitful progress in the negotiations is not surprising given the mistrust between the parties, especially in the wake of UNITA's earlier rejection of the political process. Thanks, however, to the efforts of the Special Representative, the support of the Government of Zambia and the three observer States and the perseverance of the parties themselves, we have seen some real progress in recent weeks. The Lusaka Protocol has been initialled and signed and a cease-fire declared.

Today, we have had confirmation from the Secretary-General that the cease-fire is generally holding. We support his decision in these circumstances to proceed with the re-establishment of the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II) to its previous levels, on the understanding that the cease-fire is strictly observed and the safety of United Nations personnel ensured.

This step should be an important confidence-building measure for the parties and provide information and reassurance to the international community. We welcome the progress these developments represent. We urge the parties to hold to the path they are now on and to secure the fulfilment of the Lusaka process.

As the resolution that we have just adopted signals, the international community is prepared to help. In particular, this Council is prepared to consider the establishment of an expanded United Nations presence to assist in the implementation of the Lusaka agreement and the reconstruction of Angola. The essential precondition is peace. We urge the Angolan parties not to lose the opportunity which this moment represents. For its part, New Zealand, which is already contributing personnel to UNAVEM II, including the current Chief of Staff, is giving active consideration to what contribution it might be able to make to an expanded United Nations presence.

Mr. Marker (Pakistan): I wish to join all the previous speakers who have welcomed the presence here today of His Excellency the Foreign Minister of Angola and his important statement. I should also like to congratulate the Foreign Minister for the promising developments reached by his country after long years of turmoil, strife and destruction. The Government of Pakistan sincerely hopes that, from now on, Angola will continue to progress and to emerge as a strong, unified country on the continent of Africa.

We also owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the Secretary-General and to his Special Representative, Maître Blondin Beye, for the dedication, determination and diplomatic skill with which he has pursued his mandate in Angola.

My delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted, in the sincere hope and belief that the leaders of Angola will continue to exhibit the same statesmanship as that which made the Lusaka Protocol a reality. We also hope that the Government of Angola will now be able single-mindedly to pursue the reconstruction and rehabilitation of its devastated country and that the international community will help it in this laudable objective.

In conclusion, my delegation would wish to pay tribute to the three observer States and the Government of Zambia for their untiring efforts, which have made such a vast contribution to the peace process in Angola and to the signing of the Lusaka Protocol.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Rwanda.

My delegation first wishes to welcome His Excellency Mr. De Moura and to congratulate him on being here at this time, which is a historic one for his country.

My delegation pays tribute to the Secretary-General for his outstanding report on the United Nations Angola Verification Mission (UNAVEM II). The historic content of this report explains and justifies the wind of hope that is blowing through Angola and the work of the Security Council. The Rwandese delegation also takes this opportunity to pay a resounding tribute to Maître Blondin Beye, the Secretary-General's Special Representative, for the remarkable work he has done in the search for a just, equitable and lasting peace in Angola.

Indeed, the peace process in Angola has been strewn with obstacles that have almost disheartened people of good political will in their search for a just and lasting peace in that country, which has suffered so long from a merciless civil war and its succession of murderous jolts.

The achievement of the Lusaka Protocol, initialled on 31 October and signed on 20 November 1994, has made the joy and pleasure of my delegation all the greater, since the work of the architects of peace was

accomplished in masterly fashion and inspires us with hope for the future. The Rwandese delegation cannot fail to extend its heartfelt thanks to all the forces which, directly or indirectly, have helped to usher in a new era of peace conducive to national reconciliation, reconstruction and the socio-economic development of war-devastated Angola.

In order to prevent any potential deviation, howsoever minor, from the cease-fire concluded on 22 November, my delegation supports the concept of restoring UNAVEM II to its previous strength of 350 military observers and 126 police observers, supported by sufficient international and local personnel.

To be sure, the initial phases of any implementation of a peace agreement is delicate and fragile, and the international community — represented in this case by the Security Council — is called upon to redouble its vigilance *vis-à-vis* the Angolan question, the successful political conclusion of which my delegation applauds. On the basis of the Secretary-General's report of 4 December 1994, the Rwandese delegation welcomes the prospects now open for UNAVEM III, which could help to make this new era of peace and national reconciliation in Angola irreversible.

It is fitting also to welcome the emergency plans and other preparations worked out by the Secretary-General to facilitate the varied assistance for Angola as it faces the great challenge of implementing the "Acordos de Paz" and the Lusaka Protocol. My delegation praises the good political will of the Government of the Republic of Angola and of UNITA, which have just penned a glorious page in the contemporary history of Africa by ending the 20-year fratricidal war.

Though it has been long in coming, the example of Angola will go down in the annals of the history of Africa and United Nations diplomacy, to the joy and happiness of the Angolan people and the international community. In this context, it is useful and desirable to extend the mandate of UNAVEM II to 8 February 1995 and to urge the former parties to the Angolan conflict to be scrupulous in the implementation of the "Acordos de Paz" and the Lusaka Protocol.

In conclusion, my delegation makes an appeal to all countries, particularly those which sell arms and improve their economies by fanning tensions in Africa — well do we remember Katanga, Biafra, Rwanda, Mozambique and of course Angola, to name but a few — these same countries that are now striving to extinguish the flames they have ignited. We appeal to them, rather than sending arms and mercenaries to Africa, to send tractors, computers and other tools that are needed for the rebuilding of our countries.

How can they expect Africa to develop if we are taught only how to kill each other? The money spent on this kind of exercise could have been better used towards the development of these countries. The money and time spent rebuilding property destroyed by war fuelled from outside could have helped our countries make a significant economic recovery. The countries that financed and supported fratricidal wars in Angola have a moral duty to share the national reconstruction tasks with the Angolans.

My delegation voted in favour of the resolution extending UNAVEM II because it symbolizes the praiseworthy determination of the international community to continue to support national reconciliation, peace and political stability in Angola.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3478

Security Council

Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3478th Meeting

Tuesday, 13 December 1994, 3.15 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Wang Xuexian
	Czech Republic	Mr. Kovanda
	Djibouti	Mr. Badri
	France	Mr. Thiebaud
	New Zealand	Mr. Keating
	Nigeria	Mr. Gambari
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Spain	Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mrs. Albright

Agenda

The situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

94-87427 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina

The President (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Misic (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Mr. Nobilo (Croatia) took places at the Council table.

The President (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/1994/1414, which contains the text of a letter dated 12 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Bangladesh to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council strongly condemns the deliberate attack on Bangladeshi United Nations peace-keepers on 12 December 1994 in Velika Kladusa, in the region of Bihac in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The attacked personnel of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) were travelling in an armoured personnel carrier, unmistakably carrying clear United Nations markings. It was hit by a wire-guided anti-tank missile resulting in one death and injuries to four other Bangladeshi personnel.

"The Security Council expresses profound regret at the casualties suffered by the United Nations peace-keepers as a result of this unprovoked and dastardly attack. It wishes to convey its deep condolences to the Government of Bangladesh as well as to the families of the affected soldiers.

"The Security Council endorses the protest that UNPROFOR has made to the Abdic forces and to the local Serb authorities in Knin, and its warning to the authorities in Pale.

"The Security Council is outraged at this incident of direct attack on UNPROFOR personnel and demands that such attacks do not recur. It warns the perpetrators of the attack that their heinous act of violence carries corresponding individual responsibility."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/1994/79.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 4.30 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3479

Security Council

Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3479th Meeting

Wednesday, 14 December 1994, 3.30 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	Djibouti	Mr. Olhaye
	France	Mr. Thiebaud
	New Zealand	Mr. van Bohemen
	Nigeria	Mr. Gambari
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Shkourko
	Spain	Mr. Zulueta
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Plumbly
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Mozambique

Letter dated 1 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1373)

94-87452 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Mozambique

Letter dated 1 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1373)

The President (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Mozambique in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Afonso (Mozambique) took a place at the Council table.

The President (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in response to the request contained in a letter dated 1 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, document S/1994/1373.

Members of the Council have received photocopies of a letter dated 13 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, which will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/1994/1417.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council welcomes the installation of the President of the Republic of Mozambique and the inauguration of the new Assembly of the Republic of Mozambique following the first Mozambican multi-party elections, as provided for in the General Peace Agreement, that were held on 27, 28 and 29 October 1994, which were declared as having been free and fair and were endorsed by the Council in its resolution 960 (1994) of 21 November 1994.

"The Security Council congratulates the people and the parties of Mozambique for their peaceful fulfilment of the goals set out in the General Peace Agreement. It encourages them to continue their efforts in good faith to ensure post-election harmony on the basis, *inter alia*, of the observance of democratic principles. It believes that, with the new governmental structure in place, the foundations have been laid to secure lasting peace, stability, national reconciliation and democracy.

"The Security Council commends the Secretary-General, his Special Representative and the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) and its staff for their fulfilment of the mandate of ONUMOZ and for their efforts in assisting the successful achievement of the objectives of the General Peace Agreement.

"The Security Council notes that, ONUMOZ having completed its mission, its mandate has come to an end and ONUMOZ will be finally withdrawn from Mozambique by 31 January 1995 in accordance with resolution 957 (1994) of 15 November 1994. In this connection, it looks forward to the Secretary-General's report on the final disposition of the assets of ONUMOZ within the framework of the withdrawal of ONUMOZ, as requested in its statement of 7 September 1994 (S/PRST/1994/51). In that context, it also expresses the hope that effective arrangements for the disposition and, as appropriate, the destruction of weapons and the establishment, with the assistance of the United Nations, of a national demining capability will be in place prior to the final withdrawal of ONUMOZ, and that consideration will be given to leaving demining and other equipment in Mozambique after the withdrawal, subject to the appropriate arrangements.

"The Security Council emphasizes that the post-election period will be an important and delicate time, during which there is a continuing need for the international community to assist the Government and people of Mozambique in the reconstruction and redevelopment of their country. It notes the intention of the Secretary-General to report to the competent United Nations bodies on future United Nations activities in Mozambique. It urges all States and relevant international organizations to contribute actively to these efforts."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/1994/80.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.15 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3480

Security Council
Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3480th Meeting
Wednesday, 14 December 1994, 4.15 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	Djibouti	Mr. Olhaye
	France	Mr. Thiebaud
	New Zealand	Mr. van Bohemen
	Nigeria	Mr. Gambari
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Shkourko
	Spain	Mr. Sanchez
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. Plumbly
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

Letter dated 14 December 1994 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 724 (1991) concerning Yugoslavia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1418)

94-87458 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Letter dated 14 December 1994 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 724 (1991) concerning Yugoslavia addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1418)

The President (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/1994/1418, which contains the text of a letter dated 14 December 1994 from the Chairman of the Security Council Committee established by resolution 724 (1991) concerning Yugoslavia addressed to the President of the Security Council.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1994/1419, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Djibouti, France, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President (*interpretation from French*): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 967 (1994).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 4.20 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3481

Security Council
Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3481st Meeting
Thursday, 15 December 1994, 11.30 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
later:	Mr. Cárdenas	(Argentina)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	Djibouti	Mr. Olhaye
	France	Mr. Mérimée
	New Zealand	Mr. Keating
	Nigeria	Mr. Gambari
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Rwanda	Mr. Kagame
	Spain	Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation concerning Rwanda

94-87470 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 12.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation concerning Rwanda

The President (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations.

According to rule 20 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council,

> "Whenever the President of the Security Council deems that for the proper fulfilment of the responsibilities of the presidency he should not preside over the Council during the consideration of a particular question with which the member he represents is directly connected, he shall indicate his decision to the Council. The presidential chair shall then devolve, for the purpose of the consideration of that question, on the representative of the member next in English alphabetical order ..."

The Council will note that this provision places the matter entirely within the discretion of the President. Having considered the matter, I have decided that it would be appropriate for me to exercise the discretion given to the President under rule 20 and to vacate the Chair while this item is being discussed. I trust the Council will agree with me that this is the fair and proper way to proceed.

Consequently, in accordance with rule 20 and bearing in mind the Council's decision of 16 September 1994 (S/PRST/1994/55), I invite the representative of Argentina to take the presidential Chair for the purpose of the consideration of the item on our agenda today.

Mr. Cárdenas (Argentina) took the Chair.

The President (*interpretation from Spanish*): The first speaker is the Vice-President and Minister of Defence of Rwanda, His Excellency Major-General Paul Kagame. I welcome the Vice-President and Minister of Defence of Rwanda and invite him to make his statement.

Mr. Kagame (Rwanda): It is a great honour to address the Council, and it gives me an appropriate opportunity to extend warm thanks to the Security Council and its members for the support they gave my country during the difficult times through which we have passed. On behalf of my Government and the Rwandese people, I ask the Council to accept my presence here as a sincere sign of gratitude.

Our thanks are also addressed to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who did whatever he could in seeking solutions to the problems in my country and the region. With his help and wisdom, invaluable work was accomplished, although much still remains to be done.

The world will never forget the tragedy that struck our country, the worst to befall the human race since the Holocaust. We took our courage in our hands and fought to stop the genocide. Our thanks go to the Rwandese people, who stood almost alone, although we know that others were with us then, even if not physically. The defeated former Government forces destroyed everything in our country that they found in their path, killing and raping innocent civilians and looting whatever they could lift and carry off. The scars of the deep wounds inflicted on our civil society are still clearly visible throughout the country, a country we are determined, as a matter of urgency, to rebuild and give a new sense of justice and unity.

Our country has known difficult times before — although not as far back as the international media have put it. The recent genocide perpetrated by the forces of evil is an example of what can result when men act with sanctioned impunity: violence and more violence, refugees and more refugees, throughout the region.

Our neighbours have on their soil a mixture of new Rwandese refugees, a blend of armed killers, still in uniform, and the innocent population. Both groups are continually being misled by the very leaders who engineered the earlier and the most recent massacres. The criminals enjoy support and are strengthened by international assistance directed to them almost blindly because of inconsistent policies and the violation of laws and rules governing some United Nations bodies, such as the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, with regard to who is a refugee and who is not. Those criminals have once again taken the law into their own hands and have started to intimidate and kill

their own hands and have started to intimidate and kill ordinary, innocent people who are longing to return home.

The innocent refugees are clearly being held hostage, without the international community's being able — ironically — to stop it. We certainly want those hostages to be free and to return to their homeland. We are expecting them home, but await adequate means to ensure their safe return and resettlement.

It is deplorable that the intimidation being inflicted on those innocent people continues unchallenged. The strength of the criminal groups has been overestimated. We believe they can be disarmed decisively and relocated to places where they cannot pose an immediate security threat to Rwanda. We appeal to the international community, within the framework of the United Nations, to assist Zaire in dealing with this problem.

The strength of the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR), which was reduced from 2,800 to 270 when the massacres in Rwanda started, has now reached a high figure of 5,600. Its present role is certainly appreciated, and that is the reason why my Government favoured the renewal of its mandate.

Within the country the Rwandese Government has made the following arrangements: a broad-based transitional government and National Assembly have been set up in the spirit of the Arusha Peace Agreement signed on 4 August 1993. In that same spirit we are glad to have welcomed back about 2,500 soldiers from the former Government forces, among them 70 officers, including senior officers; they are participating in reorientation programmes in various parts of the country. The programmes will soon be over, and their reintegration will be effective in a matter of weeks.

Our Government has done what it could to meet the immediate needs of the population, but we do not have adequate means to do so and to put into practice our principles of good governance based on justice for all Rwandese regardless of what used to divide us. We appeal to the international community to shoulder its responsibility to assist us in helping Rwandese to help themselves.

Delaying or refusing assistance to our Government will in the end diminish confidence and undermine the trust we expect from the Rwandese population. It would also increase pressure on the international donor community and keep the syndrome of "donor fatigue" alive. Time is pressing; the longer we wait, the worse the situation becomes.

We believe that Rwandese people should be helped to help themselves and should be given the chance to prove they can do it in the way most likely to achieve nationhood in justice, tolerance, reconciliation and unity.

Peace and stability in Rwanda and in the region depend upon what the international community can do and how swiftly it can do it. Sending the right strong signals to criminals and addressing the problem of impunity in the region certainly constitute the best solution for all of us. The international community has already understood that stability and the rule of law can stem only from taking proper measures to address the problem of impunity — and taking them swiftly enough to ensure justice, unity and the development of the idea of nationhood free from division and sectarianism.

The President (*interpretation from Spanish*): There are no further speakers for this meeting.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3482

Security Council
Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3482nd Meeting
Friday, 16 December 1994, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Kovanda
	Djibouti	Mr. Dorani
	France	Mr. Mérimée
	New Zealand	Mr. Keating
	Nigeria	Mr. Gambari
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Spain	Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Tajikistan (S/1994/1363)

94-87488 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Tajikistan and along the Tajik-Afghan border

Report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Tajikistan (S/1994/1363)

The President (*interpretation from French*): I should like to inform the Security Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Tajikistan in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kayumov (Tajikistan) took a place at the Council table.

The President *(interpretation from French)*: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in Tajikistan, document S/1994/1363.

Members of the Council also have before them document S/1994/1415, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

The first speaker is the representative of Tajikistan, on whom I now call.

Mr. Kayumov (Tajikistan) (*interpretation from Russian*): Allow me first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on your accession to the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December and to wish you success in carrying out this difficult and responsible task.

I should also like to express sincere gratitude to the Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, Ambassador Madeleine Albright, for her intensive and far-ranging work as President of the Security Council in the month of November.

I should like to seize the opportunity of this first statement in the Security Council to express the deepest respect and sincere gratitude of the people and Government of Tajikistan to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, His Excellency Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for his unswerving dedication to the cause of the maintenance of peace and security and for his energetic efforts to promote a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Tajikistan.

Our delegation has carefully studied the Secretary-General's report of 30 November on the situation in Tajikistan and shares its fundamental conclusions and recommendations. My Government supports the Security Council draft resolution concerning the establishment of a United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT) and expresses the hope that its size will be increased. My Government is relying on the fact that the appeals of the major organ of the United Nations with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security will be heard by all of the parties to the conflict.

My Government is convinced that only political dialogue, in combination with the measures we are undertaking to democratize the country's political life — the adoption of a new Constitution, presidential elections and the forthcoming parliamentary and local elections, on 26 February 1995 — will pave the way towards national reconciliation in Tajikistan.

I have been asked to report to members of the Security Council that the leadership of Tajikistan is carrying out a consistent policy aimed at achieving national reconciliation and that it considers the Agreement on a Temporary Cease-fire and the Cessation of Other Hostile Acts on the Tajik-Afghan Border and within the Country, and the extension of the Agreement's term, as an initial success in this direction. It is fully determined to build on these achievements and to do all in its power to comply with the Agreement.

In reiterating my Government's dedication to the search for ways to put an end to the conflict through the inter-Tajik negotiations, I should like to emphasize that

this difficult quest to achieve complex solutions can be successful only with the parties' unswerving compliance with their commitments under the Agreement on a Temporary Cease-fire and the Cessation of Other Hostile Acts on the Tajik-Afghan Border and within the Country.

We are most seriously concerned by the continuing and — in a number of recent cases — increased attempts by recalcitrant factions of the opposition to inflame the atmosphere by acts of sabotage, the seizure of hostages and acts of terror against peaceful citizens, in particular against members of the intelligentsia. In the period since 20 October 1994 alone, opposition fighters have violated the provisions of the Agreement on a Temporary Cease-fire more than 50 times. There have been 34 attempts by armed groups to break through the Tajik-Afghan border. Border outposts, temporary installations and military details have been shelled on approximately 20 occasions. Here, we place importance on the Council's urgent appeal to the parties to comply strictly with the obligations they have assumed to implement fully the Agreement and to refrain from any steps that could aggravate the existing situation or hinder the process towards national reconciliation.

On behalf of the Government of Tajikistan, I should like to assure the Security Council that it will cooperate fully with the United Nations Mission of Observers and will be prepared quickly to conclude with the United Nations an agreement on the status of the Mission.

I should also like to inform members of the Security Council that on 2 December of this year, in accordance with Tajikistan's new Constitution, the President of the Council of Ministers issued a decree calling upon the population voluntarily to relinquish and destroy all firearms, ammunition and military equipment — a decree confirmed by the Council of the Republic.

In Tajikistan, a new Government is being put in place. Today, instead of the former 26 ministries and State committees, the Government consists of 18 ministries and three State committees. A 20 to 30 per cent reduction of administrative staffs is being carried out. We attach great importance to the Security Council's appeal to all States and others concerned to refrain from any actions that could complicate the peace process. We hope that that appeal will also be heeded by those who are sending foreign mercenaries to join the ranks of the irreconcilable opposition factions in the territory of Afghanistan, and we are hereby officially informing the Security Council of the participation of such elements in armed attacks.

The normalization of the situation on the Tajik-Afghan border and the stabilization of the situation in Tajikistan are interlinked and interdependent processes. There is hardly any need to demonstrate the fact that armed clashes on our border with Afghanistan are fraught with serious threats to peace and security throughout the Central Asian region. In the current circumstances, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, the Russian Federation, the Republic of Tajikistan and the Republic of Uzbekistan have signed an agreement on the establishment on my country's territory of Collective Peace-keeping Forces. The Foreign Ministers of these five States officially informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, of this in their joint statements of 24 August and 30 September 1993.

The Tajik people rightfully perceive the Collective Peace-keeping Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) as a barrier to the penetration of our southern border by dangerous sparks of the fierce ongoing conflict in neighbouring Afghanistan and solely as a measure designed to protect against armed terrorism. We most ardently yearn for peace, calm and the well-being of the friendly people of Afghanistan. Our sole objective is the preservation of the territorial integrity and unity of multinational Tajikistan and the return of peace and harmony to our land.

The establishment of the Collective Peace-keeping Forces of the CIS on the basis of the Treaty on collective security between the countries of the Commonwealth is an organic element of the implementation of the principle of preventive diplomacy contained in the Secretary-General's report "Agenda for peace". We consider the formation of the Collective Peace-keeping Forces to be a regional agreement concluded in conformity with Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter and with the purposes and principles of the Organization. The neutrality and impartiality of these forces is clearly reflected in their mandate, which is cited in the Secretary-General's report on Tajikistan.

We are counting on the fact that common sense and an understanding of Tajikistan's real situation will prevail over the lingering prejudices of the period of confrontation and that the Security Council will officially proclaim its support for the activities of the CIS Collective Peace-keeping Forces.

The Security Council's efforts to participate in the activities of the humanitarian and other organizations and

agencies of the United Nations system are helping greatly to strengthen the general trend towards a stabilization of the situation of the long-suffering Tajik land. We are satisfied that the Council's members are profoundly aware of the fact that success or failure in establishing peace and harmony in our small country will inevitably affect the other States of Central Asia, since it will either help to stabilize the situation in the region or lead to a further escalation and expansion of the conflict to neighbouring States. I am convinced that the latter option will not occur.

In conclusion, I wish to express our gratitude to the Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Tajikistan, Ambassador Ramiro Píriz-Ballón, for his tireless efforts to promote political dialogue. I also thank the Governments of Iran, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Uzbekistan and other States parties to the inter-Tajik dialogue as observers. We regard highly the efforts of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Organization of the Islamic Conference aimed at promoting a political settlement to the Tajik conflict and the situation on the Tajik-Afghan border.

The Government of Tajikistan is taking the measures necessary to ensure the security of the personnel of the United Nations Mission and to protect its property. The process of Tajikistan's accession to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel is now being concluded. We sincerely hope that the joint efforts of the friends of the Tajik people will greatly help to ensure substantive progress towards national reconciliation during the course of the forthcoming fourth round of inter-Tajik talks in Moscow.

The leadership of the Republic of Tajikistan once again reaffirms its intention to make all necessary efforts to pursue negotiations to achieve the national reconciliation of the country and proposes to the armed groups of the Tajik opposition and adjacent regions of Afghanistan that they refrain from irresponsible tests of force, comply with the inter-Tajik Agreement on a Temporary Cease-fire, and thereby create the conditions necessary for a consistent search for political solutions.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Tajikistan for his kind words addressed to me.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. Al-Khussaiby (Oman): I believe that my delegation has already conveyed to you, Sir, its congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I wish, however, to assure you of our fullest cooperation with you and your delegation.

Similarly, I wish to convey our appreciation to the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Madeleine Albright, for a job well done last month.

On behalf of my delegation, allow me to extend my sincere thanks to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for his vigorous efforts and endeavours to find peaceful solutions, through preventive diplomacy, to crises around the world, among which is the conflict in Tajikistan.

While commending the work of the Secretary-General's Special Envoy for Tajikistan for the diplomatic role he has been undertaking in this regard, my delegation further welcomes the facilitating role played by the Commonwealth of Independent States, as well as the positive contributions of the neighbouring countries, which have held successful rounds of talks, under the auspices of the United Nations, aimed at the reconciliation of the two conflicting parties in Tajikistan. The last round of these talks was held in the capital of Pakistan, Islamabad, from 20 October to 1 November 1994.

My delegation strongly agrees with the Secretary-General's opinion, expressed in the last paragraph of his report dated 30 November 1994, in which he states that:

> "The problems of Tajikistan must be solved through a political process, supported by interested Governments and, through the United Nations, by the international community as a whole. But the primary responsibility for composing their differences rests with the Tajik parties themselves. The international community should provide the assistance requested of it only if the Tajik parties acknowledge that responsibility and take effective steps to discharge it." (*S/1994/1363, para. 37*)

Welcoming the positive steps that the Tajik parties have taken in signing the Agreement on a Temporary Cease-fire and the Cessation of Other Hostile Acts, and its extension, my delegation considers that the Agreement could pave the way for the creation of suitable conditions for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Tajikistan. In view of the political support of the United Nations and the neighbouring countries, and taking into consideration the fact that a resolution of the conflict is the full responsibility of the Tajik parties themselves, my country believes that there is no need for the United Nations to establish a peace-keeping operation in Tajikistan that would put an additional financial burden on this Organization.

My country's understanding of the draft resolution is that the Security Council, through the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General two months after its approval of the draft resolution, is in a position to check and monitor the performance, mandate and very existence of the operation. On the basis of this understanding, and with the aim of maintaining the prevailing consensus among the members of the Security Council and not upsetting the delicate consensus already reached, my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The President *(interpretation from French)*: I thank the representative of Oman for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Marker (Pakistan): The Government of Pakistan has remained gravely concerned at the serious political crisis in Tajikistan resulting from the differences between the Government and the opposition. This unfortunate development has been a major setback for the young republic, with which Pakistan has strong ties not only of culture and religion, but also of close cooperation as member States of the Economic Cooperation Organization (ECO).

Pakistan has remained actively involved in the international efforts to resolve the crisis peacefully and through negotiations. In this context, the Government of Pakistan has participated, as an observer, in all the rounds of inter-Tajik talks on national reconciliation. Pakistan continues to strongly support the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Envoy, Ambassador Píriz Ballón, to facilitate the process of national reconciliation in Tajikistan.

Pakistan had the honour of hosting the third round of inter-Tajik talks, held in Islamabad from 20 October to 1 November 1994, under the auspices of the United Nations. At this round of talks Pakistan, Afghanistan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation, Uzbekistan, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC) participated as observers. In Islamabad the extension of the Tehran Agreement on a Temporary Cease-fire and the Cessation of Other Hostile Acts was negotiated, and the two parties agreed to extend this cease-fire Agreement by a further three months until 6 February 1995. Also at this meeting the two sides signed a Protocol on the establishment of a Joint Commission to monitor the implementation of the Agreement. This important Protocol contains provisions for the functioning of the Joint Commission, for which logistic and material support is to be provided by both the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan and the Tajik opposition. The role of the United Nations in assisting the work of the Joint Commission is also defined in the Protocol. It is a matter of great satisfaction that during the Islamabad talks the Pakistan Government actively participated in the negotiations, which succeeded in breaking the serious deadlock between the two Tajik parties. This led to the successful conclusion of the Islamabad round of talks.

Pakistan will continue to participate actively, as an observer, in the next round of talks, which are expected to be held in Moscow in January 1995. It is the earnest hope of the Pakistan delegation that at this round both Tajik parties will once again make sincere efforts to achieve further progress in order to resolve their differences, thus paving the way for an overall settlement of the crisis. In this connection, my delegation feels that during this extremely delicate period it is imperative for all parties to exercise the utmost restraint. My delegation therefore cautions against any hasty or unilateral action, such as the precipitate holding of elections or any violation of the cease-fire Agreement. We urge the extension of the cease-fire Agreement, and the continuation of the dialogue.

The Pakistan delegation fully supports the draft resolution. With its adoption, all the important recommendations in the report (S/1994/1363) of the Secretary-General will have been acted upon, and the stage will be set to create the necessary conditions to achieve national reconciliation and a political solution to the crisis in Tajikistan. The establishment of a United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT) is an important development which will contribute positively to the process by providing a neutral and objective mechanism.

While the implementation of the many steps outlined in the draft resolution will no doubt contribute to confidence-building measures between the parties, it remains necessary for Member States to contribute generously to the voluntary fund to be established by the Secretary-General, to support the implementation of the Agreement of 17 September 1994 on a Temporary Cease-fire — in particular, from delegations in support of the activities of the Joint Commission.

My delegation would like to emphasize the point that while the passage of this draft resolution is no doubt important in creating the necessary conditions for political reconciliation in Tajikistan, the ultimate responsibility for reaching a durable and lasting peace lies with the Government and people of Tajikistan.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation attaches great importance to the adoption by the Security Council of the draft resolution establishing the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT). This is an important step that has long needed to be taken. We view the creation of this Mission as a definite shift in the position of the Security Council in terms of paying greater attention to the settlement of conflicts in the Member States of the Commonwealth of Independent States. We hope that this trend will be reinforced and developed further.

We are convinced that the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan will act as a stabilizing factor in the situation there, and will promote the successful implementation of the Agreement reached at the third round of inter-Tajik talks in Islamabad. At the same time, we believe that at a later stage in the settlement, we will have once again to return to the question of the size of the Mission.

One positive aspect of the draft resolution is that it steers the parties towards the need to seek energetically ways and means to find a comprehensive political settlement to the conflict. The Russian Federation is convinced that there is no alternative to peaceful political means to end the conflict in Tajikistan and the situation on the Tajik-Afghan border, on the basis of constructive dialogue between the parties to the conflict.

We welcome and actively support the efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Envoy, Ambassador Píriz-Ballón to promote national reconciliation in Tajikistan. Together with other States and regional organizations participating in the inter-Tajik talks as observers, and in close cooperation with the United Nations efforts, Russia is making its own contribution to advancing the peace process.

We attach great importance to the achievement of substantive progress at the forthcoming fourth round of inter-Tajik talks, to be held in Moscow. This will be a complex round at which there will be discussion of fundamental political and constitutional issues. We wish every success to Ambassador Píriz-Ballón in his preparations for this round.

At the same time, it is obvious that constructive political dialogue can take place only in conditions of strict and full compliance by the parties with all the commitments they have undertaken in accordance with the Cease-fire Agreement and the Cessation of Other Hostile Acts on the Tajik-Afghan border and within the country.

Here, we are seriously concerned by the fact that the intransigent segment of the opposition is continuing to carry out acts of provocation on the border, as well as sabotage and terrorist acts within the country.

We believe that the implementation of the commitments assumed by the parties must be unconditional. Compliance with the provisions of the Agreement that has been concluded should be considered not as a trump card to be exchanged for concessions on other questions, but as a prerequisite for conducting political dialogue. We hope that the appeals contained in the draft resolution will play a positive role in this regard.

The Russian delegation takes note that the draft resolution emphasizes the important significance of close ties between the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT) and the Collective Peace-keeping Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States in Tajikistan, support for which is included in the mandate of the United Nations mission.

We reaffirm our readiness for close cooperation between the Collective Peace-keeping Forces of the CIS and UNMOT and our interest in such cooperation. The Collective Peace-keeping Forces of the CIS and the United Nations observer mission have separate mandates, but a single goal: to promote the stabilization of the situation and the process of national reconciliation in Tajikistan, a process which requires their interaction.

In conclusion, I should like to appeal to the United Nations Secretariat to implement as quickly as possible the decision of the Council which, I hope, will be adopted unanimously, and to deploy the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan in accordance with the plan set out by the Secretary-General in his report.

We are also counting on the fact that after the adoption of this draft resolution a voluntary fund will be effectively established in support of the implementation of the Agreement of 17 September and that the Member States of the United Nations will actively respond to the appeal contained in the draft resolution to make voluntary contributions to this fund.

Mr. Kovanda (Czech Republic): Mr. President, as this is the first time my delegation has spoken in the Council this month, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the office of the presidency of the Council. Let me also thank and congratulate Ambassador Albright for the remarkable skills she and her entire delegation displayed last month.

By authorizing a peace-keeping operation in Tajikistan, the Security Council is about to give United Nations a far more active role in yet another region of the former Soviet Union. And with the exception of the small operation of very limited duration in Chad's Aouzou Strip, this is the only operation that the Security Council has authorized this year.

Meanwhile, several other operations are being phased out, based on decisions of the Council. We are closing down the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II) which, despite its success in overcoming the famine and starvation of millions of people, has in essence turned out to be a failure as far as the political process is concerned. We are also closing down the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) which, precisely in terms of the political process, has been remarkably successful. In light of the lessons drawn from these two operations, we contemplate the prospects of the United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan (UNMOT).

All three of these operations represent a relatively new challenge to the United Nations, for we are dealing with critical preconditions for the peaceful and democratic domestic development of the countries in question. The success of these operations is measured by the degree to which national reconciliation is attained.

In this context, my delegation has been consistently concerned about the fragility of the arrangements so far reached by the belligerent parties in Tajikistan. Fundamental institutional issues, including the consolidation of the country's very political make-up, have not yet been addressed by the parties. The next round of political talks, originally scheduled to take place in Moscow in early December, has been postponed for at least a month. The cease-fire that the parties have been grudgingly observing has been conditioned by the presence of United Nations observers, turning a principle on its head; for we would generally predicate the dispatch of observers, to whatever location, on the existence of an effective cease-fire. And it took the parties months beyond their original deadline to accomplish an exchange of prisoners and detainees that they themselves had agreed to. These are not encouraging signs.

Even in this light, though, we believe that the Security Council has absorbed certain lessons. To nail down certain basic prerequisites for a United Nations operation to be successful, the Council has adequately addressed the following important elements in the draft resolution before us.

First, a realistic and practical mandate, which follows the proposals of the Secretary-General, is reflected in the text of the draft. Secondly, the time framework for UNMOT has been clarified. Furthermore, there is a clear link between our commitment — that is, of international assistance — and the political process in Tajikistan — that is, of national reconciliation. We think that this is an appropriate formulation of the question, since the whole process is still based on a Cease-fire Agreement which even describes itself as provisional or "temporary". Thirdly, we are sending an important message to both parties — namely, that the responsibility for adhering to the cease-fire rests with the Tajik parties themselves. What we are undertaking is only to assist the Joint Commission, the instrument for implementing it. An effective cease-fire in turn should help create an atmosphere in which political talks can lead to national reconciliation. Fourthly, our draft provides for regular reviews by the Security Council of the overall political and military situation in Tajikistan and of UNMOT's performance. Fifthly — and finally — it also includes a call to parties to ensure the safety and freedom of movement of United Nations personnel. We expect the Government of Tajikistan expeditiously to conclude an agreement on the status of UNMOT with the United Nations. But at any rate, any infringement of the security or freedom of movement of our observers would surely

be considered in a very serious light when UNMOT's future next comes up for discussion.

There is one more reason why my delegation is paying special attention to Tajikistan. The draft resolution sets a clear framework for the activities of other forces in Tajikistan and for their close liaison with UNMOT. This framework reflects a principle which we consider vital for the performance of these other forces — which are in the country at the invitation of only one of the parties: the principle of neutrality and impartiality which, for that matter, is embodied in their mandate.

We hope that periodically more information on the relationship of the United Nations mission with these other forces will be available. There is a clear need for transparency in the activities of the Collective Peace-Keeping Forces of the CIS as well as of the non-Tajik border forces in Tajikistan. My Government believes that monitoring their neutrality and impartiality should be a part of UNMOT's job. In fact, this is one aspect of the situation which the draft resolution does not in our opinion reflect as fully as it might have.

On other matters, though, informal consultations have yielded a text that well balances the different concerns of Security Council members, and my delegation will vote for its adoption. More than that, discussions are already under way about the participation of Czech military observers in UNMOT.

In closing, let me pay tribute to the several countries of the region and to the several organizations, including the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), that have acted as midwives and godfathers to the progress attained so far, as well as to the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General's Special Envoy, whose advice and counsel my delegation has invariably found useful.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the Czech Republic for the kind words he addressed to me.

I now put to the vote the draft resolution in document S/1994/1415.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Djibouti, France, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President *(interpretation from French):* There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 968 (1994).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. Mérimée (France) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation welcomes the decision just adopted by our Council to establish, for a six-month period, a United Nations Mission of Observers in Tajikistan to assist the Joint Commission to monitor the implementation of the Agreement of 17 September 1994.

In the presidential statement of 8 November 1994 (S/PRST/1994/65) the Security Council welcomed the extension until 6 February 1995 of the Agreement on a Temporary Cease-fire and the Cessation of Other Hostile Acts — the extension agreed upon in Islamabad between the Tajik parties, and it called on the parties to pursue the goal of an overall political settlement. The agreement reached in Islamabad was a positive step, deserving of support, and the resolution just adopted concretely reflects our determination to help the parties implement it.

The effective maintenance of the cessation of hostilities is essential to the continuation of the process that should lead Tajikistan to national reconciliation, to the holding of free and fair elections and to the establishment of democracy. We feel that no effort should be spared in promoting the speedy achievement of a political agreement within the framework of negotiations under United Nations auspices, with the assistance of several States in the region. Indeed, the resolution just adopted makes this progress a precondition for continued United Nations assistance to Tajikistan.

There is no intention whatever to take the place of the parties themselves, for they have primary responsibility for the political settlement of their disputes. However, the signal sent today by our Council should encourage them to continue along the path of negotiation that they have chosen. In this respect, my delegation would recall the paramount importance of holding at an early date the fourth round of inter-Tajik talks, scheduled to take place in Moscow. We earnestly hope that this meeting will yield substantive results.

Finally, my delegation would like to pay tribute to the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Píriz-Ballón, whose perseverance is greatly appreciated.

Sir David Hannay (United Kingdom): My delegation warmly welcomes the resolution which this Council has just adopted. It represents a recognition, on the part of the Council, not only of the suffering caused by the conflict in Tajikistan, but of the progress made so far in the process of national reconciliation. In that context, I should like to pay tribute to the role of the Russian Federation, the other States observers at the inter-Tajik talks, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, as well as the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Píriz-Ballón, for helping make possible the progress achieved so far.

Much more, however, needs to be done. I appeal today to the parties to show the political will necessary to carry this work forward. As the resolution which we have just adopted recognizes, the international community can assist and facilitate the process of national reconciliation in Tajikistan, but it is the parties themselves who bear the primary responsibility for resolving their differences. In particular, we hope for substantive progress at the fourth round of inter-Tajik talks, planned to take place in Moscow.

It is essential that the Secretary-General is able to report, by 6 February, not only that the cease-fire has been extended but also that progress is continuing with national reconciliation and the promotion of democracy. A new United Nations Mission of this sort needs to be linked to a clear political process resulting in a negotiated settlement and a representative and sustainable national government. I should like to emphasize, in this context, the importance that my delegation attaches to the holding of free and fair elections, in which the Tajik opposition must be able to participate fully. I hope that the Government of Tajikistan will draw upon the expertise and advice of the CSCE Mission in Dushanbe, and of the United Nations, in preparing for those elections.

Tajikistan's emergence as a sovereign and independent State has been cruelly undermined by civil strife and the human misery that has ensued from it. The establishment of a United Nations Mission of Observers is a small but significant helping hand along the path of national reconciliation and economic regeneration. Perhaps the best thing we can wish for the people of Tajikistan is that the United Nations will soon be able to turn its attention in that country from monitoring a cease-fire to post-conflict economic reconstruction.

Mr. Inderfurth (United States of America): Today we have decided to send a team of 40 United Nations military observers to Tajikistan to assist the parties in maintaining a cease-fire in a civil war that has claimed too many victims. With this decision, the Security Council and the international community have shown their willingness to involve themselves in the resolution of this conflict. This represents a major step that should not be judged by the size of the Mission. Already, the 17 United Nations military observers in place have played an important role in resolving allegations of cease-fire violations and working with the Joint Commission for the Implementation of the Agreement of 17 September 1994. Increasing their number to 40 will allow this work to take place in many more politically sensitive locations.

I would emphasize, however, that the Council's mandate for this observer Mission appropriately states that the parties in Tajikistan themselves bear the primary responsibility for resolving their differences. The resolution underlines this point by clearly linking the observer Mission's future to the process of national reconciliation. The Mission is being dispatched to assist the parties to the conflict, working in coordination with other interested parties as well as with forces already on the ground.

The parties, with the able assistance of the Secretary- General's Special Envoy, Ambassador Píriz-Ballón, have shown that they can make progress toward reconciliation. The initial cease-fire has been extended until 6 February 1995. The parties should act quickly to extend the cease-fire well beyond that date; indeed, the cease-fire must be extended and adhered to if the Mission is to remain beyond that date. The parties have also engaged in political discussions and have carried out an exchange of prisoners. They should resume their discussions in earnest, with the intention of taking further meaningful steps toward peace and participating in additional exchanges of prisoners and other confidence-building measures.

The parliamentary elections present a special opportunity to advance national reconciliation, but only if their timing and conduct are such that a broad range of parties is allowed to participate and the voting process is free and fair. We hope that the elections will be a central topic of discussions at the next round of peace talks in Moscow.

The observer Mission is being sent to Tajikistan to help assure the parties that if they take these steps they will have the assistance and the support of the United Nations. At the same time, they should understand that this coin of the international community's willingness to help has a reverse side: failure to engage genuinely in the process of reconciliation will jeopardize this support. The Council will be following developments in Tajikistan with attention and hopeful confidence.

Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo (Spain) *(interpretation from Spanish):* The Security Council has just unanimously adopted resolution 968 (1994) by which it decided to establish a new United Nations peace-keeping mission which, together with the Joint Commission established by the parties, will assist in consolidating the agreed cease-fire in Tajikistan, which came into effect on 20 October 1994 and which is an integral part of the political process leading to the solution of the conflict.

I wish to stress, first of all, my delegation's admiration of the mediation efforts of the Secretary-General and, in particular, of his Special Envoy, Ambassador Píriz-Ballón, without whose patience and tireless efforts such favourable progress would not have been possible in the process which the Security Council is now helping to strengthen.

We should also mention the effective cooperation, in these efforts, of Afghanistan, Iran, Kazakhstan, Pakistan, the Russian Federation and Uzbekistan and the representatives of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

With the establishment of a United Nations Observer Mission in Tajikistan (UNMOT) and its full deployment on the basis of the 15 military observers who have already been working there since October and to whom will now be added new personnel, it will be more difficult for hostilities between the parties to resume. We hope that a long period of calm there will make it possible to implement new confidence-building measures and also to further the process of national reconciliation. This should lead to the holding of free and democratic elections with the broadest possible participation, giving the country a legitimate and broad-based government.

My delegation wishes, however, to point out that the presence of the United Nations Observer Mission is not unconditional or of indefinite duration. Paragraph 3 of resolution 968 (1994) clearly establishes the need for the cease-fire agreement to be extended and for the parties to have clearly demonstrated that they have abandoned the course of violence.

The Council must also have tangible proof, in the form of the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General, that the parties have indeed moved towards national reconciliation and the promotion of democracy. Therefore, the next round of negotiations, to be held in Moscow, must record significant progress in the political process, for that is essential to the solution of the conflict.

We should also emphasize the need for close contact and cooperation in the field between the United Nations Observer Mission and the Collective Peace-keeping Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States, as well as with the forces responsible for monitoring the border with Afghanistan.

Finally, my delegation believes that the CSCE Mission established in Tajikistan can make a positive contribution to the peace process. It will therefore be necessary for UNMOT and the CSCE Mission in Dushanbé to work together, from their different standpoints and in terms of their different mandates, and thus contribute to an atmosphere conducive to national reconciliation in Tajikistan. This, in turn, should lead to greater stability in the region.

Mr. Cárdenas (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish):* The Security Council has today reached a decision on the question of Tajikistan, on the basis of a comprehensive report by the Secretary-General.

I should like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to Ambassador Píriz-Ballón of Uruguay for the splendid way in which he carried out his mission.

We would also like to express Argentina's appreciation to the Governments and regional organizations which have been working with and concretely supporting the peace process, in particular the Russian Federation, the Islamic Republic of Iran and Pakistan, all of which hosted the three important rounds of negotiations that have already taken place.

During the last two rounds of negotiations, held in Tehran and Islamabad, favourable results were produced in regard to the crisis in Tajikistan, which also affect Afghanistan. The temporary cease-fire and its subsequent extension, the exchange of prisoners between the parties,

the establishment of a joint commission, and an agreement to carry out a new round of negotiations in Moscow to take up questions such as that of arrangements for holding free democratic elections in the Tajik parliament all show the will of the parties to cooperate in the search for a solution.

Nevertheless, there are still some disturbing signs. Acts of violence continue in Tajikistan, which makes the situation somewhat volatile both in the interior of the country and along the border with Afghanistan. For these reasons, we agree with the Secretary-General's proposal for the speedy establishment of a United Nations Observer Mission in Tajikistan.

We believe that conditions already exist that justify another peace-keeping operation, namely, consent of the parties, an effective cease-fire, a clear and definite mandate in terms of time, and a financial estimate that seems to us to be realistic and moderate.

We would say that the resolution we have just adopted enjoys the cooperation of the Observer Mission and the Collective Peace-keeping Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States and the border forces from Russia, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. For my delegation all of this is a matter of priority.

Through this resolution, the Security Council is setting up its second peace-keeping operation this year, the first — we recall — being the one relating to the Aouzou Strip force in Chad. This significant event underscores the importance that the international community attributes to the situation in Tajikistan and along the border with Afghanistan.

Nevertheless, it is important to point out, as the Secretary-General does in his report and as has been pointed out by the Security Council, it is the parties themselves — the Tajik parties — who must fully assume their responsibilities and adopt all necessary measures to strengthen the peace process.

The President (*interpretation from French*): There are no other names on the list of speakers.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3483

Security Council

Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3483rd Meeting

Friday, 16 December 1994, 4.25 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Kovanda
	Djibouti	Mr. Olhaye
	France	Mr. Mérimée
	New Zealand	Mr. Keating
	Nigeria	Mr. Gambari
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Spain	Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

Security Council working methods and procedure

Letter dated 9 November 1994 from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/1994/1279)

94-87494 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Security Council working methods and procedure

Letter dated 9 November 1994 from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/1994/1279)

The President *(interpretation from French):* I should like to inform the Security Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Japan, Poland and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rowe (Australia), Mr. Sucharipa (Austria), Mr. Karsgaard (Canada), Mr. Haakonsen (Denmark), Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia), Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Fulci (Italy), Mr. Owada (Japan), Mr. Wlosowicz (Poland) and Mr. Batu (Turkey) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on the agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/1994/1279, which contains the text of a letter dated 9 November 1994 from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

I should like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to the following other documents: S/1994/1313, letter dated 18 November 1994 from the Permanent Representative of New Zealand to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council, and S/1994/1384, note verbale dated 6 December 1994 from the Permanent Representative of Brazil to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

Mr. Mérimée (France) (*interpretation from French*): The French delegation did not request a discussion of Security Council working methods and of the degree to which the Council's meetings are public in order to follow fashion or to play an attractive role in the current consideration of the transparency of the Security Council. We did so because of an observation and an evaluation.

Our observation was an obvious one: there is a certain uneasiness in relations between the Security Council and Members of the United Nations. I shall not dwell on this point, because everyone is aware of it.

Our evaluation is that this uneasiness results in large part from the fact that informal consultations have become the Council's characteristic working method, while public meetings, originally the norm, are increasingly rare and increasingly devoid of content: everyone knows that when the Council goes into public meeting everything has been decided in advance.

Thus, all of the Council's work takes place behind closed doors, without observers and without a written record. We think this is a dangerous departure. First of all, it runs counter to rule 48 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, which provides that

> "Unless it decides otherwise, the Security Council shall meet in public".

Public meetings are therefore the rule, and non-public meetings the exception. I should note that informal meetings are not even real Council meetings at all; they have no official existence, and are assigned no number. Yet it is in these meetings that all the Council's work is carried out.

The result of this situation is strong frustration and a lack of information. There is frustration among non-members of the Council; and members of the Council have inadequate information because there are too few opportunities for debate for them to understand the general feelings of those interested in items on the Council's agenda.

Two kinds of measures could deal with the drawbacks of this situation. The first — which we think would be bad — would be to make these informal

meetings more public. But informal meetings are necessary as all those involved in multilateral diplomacy know. It is during informal meetings that we achieve compromises that delegations initially accept *ad referendum* and not on the basis of instructions from the Governments. Holding such negotiations in public would obviously slow them and paralyse them. I think that is just common sense.

The other possibility, which we advocate, is to restore the balance between official meetings and informal consultations. In our view, we must distinguish between, on the one hand, information, consultation and general exchanges of views — which with some exceptions could be the subject of public debate — and, on the other hand, negotiation and the drafting of texts, for which other procedures are preferable.

That division, of course, is but a suggestion: in these matters we must flee any hint of the systematic. The choices are a matter of common sense. For example, we think that when members of the Council receive a report from the Secretary-General and conduct an exchange of views on that report, the exchange of views could be held in public. Similarly, when a Council member proposes a draft resolution, it could introduce and argue for the text in a public meeting.

That is the thrust of the French *aide-mémoire* circulated on 11 November 1994 as an official document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. Clearly, the measures it proposes are not intended to replace other transparency measures already in place, including those set out in presidential statements of 3 May 1994 (S/PRST/1994/22) and 4 November 1994 (S/PRST/1994/62) relating to consultations with troop contributing countries, but rather to supplement them.

As to the way to implement this initiative, the French delegation is open to all suggestions. We believe we should proceed without haste and should engage in experimentation. We do not think that any specific decision of the Council seems necessary, for we are merely recommending the restoration of the Council's normal practice: the rebirth of the principle of public meetings, which has never ceased, at least in writing, to be the rule. Initially, we would want each President of the Council to decide at the beginning of each monthly term to determine, through bilateral consultations, the subjects on which a public debate could be useful, and to propose a programme of such subjects to the other members of the Council. To preserve the effectiveness of the Security Council and to avoid excessively protracted debates — which would defeat the purpose of this exercise — it would also be desirable to take measures to exhort speakers to be moderate. We have no doubt that all speakers would understand that it was in their own clear interest to practise restraint and brevity.

The exercise we wish to begin is not a short-term endeavour. There is no point in acting hastily. But we must show determination if the Council is to move closer, little by little, but persistently, to a harmonious balance between public meetings and non-public consultations. We count here on the support of all delegations.

During the General Assembly debate on increase in the membership of the Security Council, many Permanent Representatives stressed the need to strengthen the trust between the Security Council and the membership of the United Nations at large. Our sole objective in having made the proposals before the Council today is to reinstate the conditions for that indispensable trust. I am profoundly convinced that this objective is not beyond our reach if we make the necessary effort.

Sir David Hannay (United Kingdom): My delegation welcomes this opportunity to discuss the proposals on Security Council working methods, first made by the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, Monsieur Alain Juppé, in his speech to the General Assembly earlier this autumn.

We believe that it is necessary to work systematically for the greatest possible transparency in the work of the Security Council consistent with its efficiency and effectiveness. The desire to enhance the flow of information and the exchange of views between the Security Council and the General Assembly lay behind the Council's decision of June 1993 to establish an informal working group on documentation and other procedural matters. That working group has met regularly, and a number of important steps have been taken following recommendations made by it. Among these are changes to the annual report, to which I referred in some detail when, as President of the Council, I had the honour to introduce this year's report of the Security Council to the General Assembly in the Assembly on 31 October.

Other steps taken include the decision that draft resolutions in "blue" should be made available to non-members of the Council and the decision to make available to all Member States the tentative forecast of

the Council's programme of work for each month. This year the practice has been instituted of annexing to that forecast a list of forthcoming reports by the Secretary-General as requested by the Council, as well as the schedule of forthcoming reviews or renewals of mandates of peace-keeping operations and of sanctions regimes.

The working group has also given consideration to the important question of briefing Member States on the progress of informal consultations, without prejudicing the confidentiality and the efficiency of the consultation system itself. The first informal presidency briefing of non-members on the current work of the Council took place, under the presidency of the United Kingdom, on 27 October. This practice has been continued during the presidencies of the United States of America and Rwanda. We believe that it should become a regular feature of Council business.

Finally, there has been much discussion this year in the Council of ways to enhance consultations and exchanges of information with troop-contributing countries regarding peace-keeping operations. The presidential statement of 4 November 1994 represented a significant step forward in this regard. Meetings will now be held, as a matter of course, between members of the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat whenever the Council is to take decisions on the extension or termination of, or on significant change in, the mandate of a particular peace-keeping operation. These meetings will be chaired jointly by the President of the Security Council and the Special Political Adviser to the Secretary-General, assisted by the Under-Secretary-General or Assistant Secretary-General for peace-keeping.

The expected schedule of such meetings will be indicated in the monthly tentative forecast of work of the Council, and each meeting will be announced, in advance, in the *Journal* of the United Nations. The Security Council has also asked that an informal paper, including topics to be covered and drawing attention to relevant documentation, be circulated by the Secretariat well in advance of such meetings.

Furthermore, the statement of 4 November 1994 made it clear that the President of the Council, in the course of informal consultations of members of the Council, will summarize the views expressed by participants at the meetings with troop-contributors. These new arrangements are in their early stages of implementation, and effort is needed by all concerned — by Council members, by troop-contributors and by the Secretariat — to make them work effectively and to the satisfaction of all. But work they must. It is important both to the troop-contributors and to Council members that the exchange of views should be as full and frank as possible.

The proposal before us today — namely, that there should be greater recourse to open meetings of the Council, particularly in the early stage of its consideration of a subject — is consistent with these other efforts that the Council is making to enhance the transparency of its work and to enable members to hear the views of other Member States, and should, in my delegation's view, be seen as complementary to them. We agree with the view expressed by the Government of France in its *aide-mémoire* that there can be no question of giving up the practice of informal consultations. That reflects the need to strike a balance between the justifiable call for greater transparency in the work of the Council and retention of its efficiency and effectiveness.

The informal consultations through which so much of the Council's work is conducted lie at the heart of the system and must be retained. But much can be done while retaining that crucial balance between transparency and effectiveness. It is in that spirit that we give our support to the French proposal. Open, public meetings of the Council not only give the general United Nations membership an indication of the thinking of Council members but also can provide an opportunity for the Council to hear the views of those most directly concerned with a given subject, such as the States from a region in which a dispute occurs.

In our prior consultations in the Council, Council members have expressed a clear will to respond favourably to this French proposal. I hope that the Council will, therefore, as part of its efforts to improve the flow of information and the exchange of ideas between members of the Council and other Members of the United Nations, have greater recourse to open meetings — in particular, at an early stage in its consideration of a subject. The Council will need to decide on a case-by-case basis when to schedule public meetings of this sort. In our view, the Working Group on Documentation and Procedure should examine this question further in the light of the views expressed today and should submit a report as soon as possible.

My delegation will listen carefully to what is said today and will participate actively and positively in further discussion and implementation of the proposal.

Mr. Li Zhaoxing (China) *(interpretation from Chinese)*: It is the consistent position of the Chinese delegation that the work of the Security Council should be transparent and democratic. Matters concerning the world should be settled by all countries through consultation, and those concerning the United Nations by all Member States through discussion on an equal footing. Making this happen is the democratization of international affairs.

Today's discussion, at a formal meeting of the Security Council, of the question of enhancing the transparency of the Council's work is an indication of the desire of its members to make the Council more democratic. The Chinese delegation welcomes and supports this move.

Under the Charter of the United Nations the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. In fulfilling this responsibility it acts on behalf of all Member States and must, therefore, be accountable to them. In this sense, democracy and transparency in the work of the Council will improve the general membership's understanding of its decision-making process, thus enhancing the authority of its decisions, as well as its credibility.

Democracy and transparency are means of enhancing the efficiency and efficacy of the Security Council. This may be the post-cold-war era, but the world is certainly not tranquil. Intermittent conflicts and crises pose new challenges to the Security Council. It should therefore enhance its efficiency in accordance with the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter to enable it to discharge more effectively its duties with regard to the maintenance of international peace and security.

If this is to happen, however, it is essential that the Council take effective measures to make its work more transparent and democratic and, thereby, ensure strong support and cooperation from the general membership at all stages of its work.

There are various ways and means of making the Security Council's work more democratic and transparent. The Council should not limit itself to a single method. Where necessary, there should be more public meetings so that the Council might hear an extensive range of Member States' views on a subject under consideration. That would be a good practice.

It is also important that members of the Security Council improve communication and information exchanges with other United Nations Members. Of equal significance is the need for the President of the Council to exchange views with the President of the General Assembly and with the chairmen of regional groups and for the Council to conduct regular consultations with troop-contributing countries.

Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil): The delegation of Brazil welcomes this opportunity to have a public debate on the working methods and procedures of the Security Council. The proposal, submitted by the delegation of France, that there should be a discussion of modalities for having greater recourse to open meetings of the Council is particularly timely, as it fits into the context of a wide-ranging process of reflection, currently under way in the United Nations, on the functioning of this principal organ.

Brazil has consistently advocated the strengthening of the Security Council through the enhancement of its legitimacy and authority before the eyes of the international community. In order to achieve this goal, it should become, not only more representative and effective, but also more transparent and accountable. Since the Council acts on behalf of all the Members of the Organization in carrying out its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, the international community has a legitimate reason to expect that the exceptional powers vested in this body will be properly exerted and accounted for.

The analysis of recent practices in the Security Council and the case for a better balance between official meetings and informal consultations, as presented in the *aide-mémoire* submitted by the delegation of France in document S/1994/1279, are quite well taken, and my delegation fully subscribes to them. The modalities proposed therein for reducing the opacity in the functioning of the Council also seem very helpful, and my delegation looks forward to examining their content in fuller detail.

I believe it is only fair to acknowledge that there have been noticeable improvements in the working methods of the Council in recent times. While these improvements may not be materializing as quickly as desired by many delegations, or to the extent they desire incremental progress is being achieved in a flexible manner. It is the expectation of my delegation that this course is irreversible and will gain further momentum.

Having said that, I would like to underscore two aspects that should be kept in perspective in the deliberations concerning the working methods and procedures of the Council.

One of them is the question of the legality of the existence of informal consultations, referred to in paragraph 12 of the French *aide-mémoire*. Indeed, the provisional rules of procedure of the Council, in their current format, make no provision for informal consultations. Rule 48 stipulates that the Council shall meet in public unless it decides otherwise. Rule 51 states that private meetings shall have a record, and rule 55 determines that at the close of each private meeting the Security Council shall issue a communiqué through the Secretary-General. Informal consultations do not fit into any of these formats.

Since a substantial and substantive portion of the work of the Council takes place within informal consultations, my delegation believes that the current rules of procedure should be updated in order, *inter alia*, to acknowledge the legal existence of informal consultations. Otherwise, we may be confronted with a paradoxical situation in which decisions having important legal consequences, such as the review of sanctions regimes, are taken at meetings that have no legal existence. Moreover, by updating the rules of procedure, adequate ways may be found to establish a proper balance between the holding of public meetings and the holding of informal consultations. My delegation deems that the Council should seriously consider this course of action, taking duly into account the views of the membership at large of the Organization.

The second aspect to be stressed is that procedural reformulations in the working methods of the Council, meritorious as they may be, should not be taken as palliatives for a substantive restructuring of the Council itself. While more transparency may help to enhance its visibility, the effectiveness of the Council in discharging its responsibilities is more directly correlated to the adequacy of its structures for present realities and challenges. Therefore, the present exercise in transparency is only one element which should be considered within the wider context of the overall efforts undertaken by the Organization's membership at large in enhancing the legitimacy, authority, representativeness and effectiveness of the Security Council.

The delegation of Brazil will continue to cooperate in this endeavour in all relevant instances of the United Nations.

Mr. Gambari (Nigeria): My delegation would like, through you, Mr. President, to thank the delegation of France for its initiative concerning the working methods of the Security Council, an issue which is not only important, but also timely, as we look forward to the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of our Organization. It is an appropriate response to some of the criticisms which have justifiably been made against the Security Council by most States Members of the United Nations. The Security Council, in which Member States have invested a great many expectations and aspirations, would be failing in its duties if it were unable to take due cognizance of the mood of the Organization's general membership relative to the need for greater transparency in its working methods.

In our view, however, it is proper to place in perspective some of the important steps which the Security Council has taken recently in response to the strong feelings expressed by the United Nations membership for more transparency, through increased and regular dialogue with members of the Security Council. These include the arrangement for regular consultations between Security Council members and troop-contributing countries and briefings of delegations of Member States by successive Presidents of the Security Council of the outcome of the Council's informal consultations, with the objective of keeping Member States abreast of current issues before the Council and of the stages of decision-making on such issues. These positive developments should be continued and even improved upon.

The French initiative under consideration, as my delegation understands it, envisages a formal meeting of the Security Council during which Member States and Security Council members will be able to express their views on matters under consideration in the Council. This is expected to precede informal consultations of the Council, which have tended to dominate the Council's working methods in recent times. My delegation agrees with the viewpoint that the present procedures do not afford Member States outside the Council — in particular, those directly concerned with the subject-matter — to express their views and thus contribute effectively to the outcome of the Council's final decisions on pertinent questions. Indeed, the current state of play, whereby Member States are able to express their views on issues only after the Security Council has already taken its decision, is definitely not very satisfactory.

My delegation believes that unless this procedure is carefully managed there is a possibility that the idea of an open meeting prior to the Council's informal consultations, as in the proposal before us, could become counter-productive. I shall explain why. We would submit that the open meetings advocated in the proposal must not be allowed to serve as an occasion for aggrieved parties to play out their differences and consequently detract from the effective conduct of the business of the Council, whose primary objective is to advance the peaceful resolution of conflicts. In order to obviate this possible difficulty it is necessary, in our view, prior to the holding of such open meetings, to agree on a structured agenda for the Council's business against the background of the Secretary-General's report on the relevant subject. Furthermore, the President of the Security Council must be given the flexibility to act on behalf of all Council members with regard to the timing, duration and regularity of such open meetings.

My delegation wishes to emphasize that transparency is a multifaceted process that transcends relationships between the Security Council and other organs of the United Nations system. It must also include greater openness among Council members within the Security Council itself, for we feel that genuine transparency on this basis must necessarily include a readiness and disposition on the part of all Council members — not some, but all — to share information fully and consult more openly and at an early stage, before proposals are formally submitted. In addition, all delegations should receive advance or regular copies of the reports of the Secretary-General at the same time, not some of them before others. Such new endeavours and new processes will engender increased confidence and facilitate decision-making involving all members of the Security Council.

Finally, the preamble of the Charter of the United Nations begins with the noble words, "We the peoples of the United Nations". The Security Council must truly act and be seen to act on behalf of the peoples of the United Nations — all of the peoples, not some of them. Reforms in the working methods of the Security Council aimed at achieving greater transparency are consistent with this Charter requirement and will ensure that the Council is more responsive and more responsible to the yearnings of the entire membership of the United Nations and accountable to it in the discharge of its duties.

Mr. Al-Khussaiby (Oman): If we study and analyse the statements made by many delegations of Members of the international Organization in the context of the plenary meetings of the current session of the General Assembly or in the discussions that took place within the Open-Ended Working Group entrusted with the task of studying Security Council membership and other questions relating to the Council's work, chances are that most of those delegations touched in one way or another on the Security Council's working methods, on the need for a greater transparency in the work of the Council and on improving the flow of information to States non-members of the Council. This is an indication of the enormous importance those delegations attach to this issue.

It is in this context that my delegation welcomes the French initiative aimed at improving transparency through a more frequent recourse to general debates prior to the Council's reaching a decision on an issue before it. We believe that that initiative, if implemented, will go a long way towards alleviating the concerns expressed by many delegations.

It would afford the States more directly concerned in a given situation or conflict, as well as troop-contributing countries, a better opportunity for an exchange of views on how the Council could best tackle a problem prior to its taking a definite stand on it. This, in our opinion, would also have a stimulating and enriching effect on the Council's discussions and deliberations on the various issues. Moreover, my delegation believes that such participation is a legitimate right of non-members of the Council stemming not only from the fact that the Council acts on their behalf but also from the fact that they are bound by its decisions.

We should like to emphasize the importance of preserving the distinctive nature of informal consultations, in which Council members feel more at ease to express more freely and openly their views on the various issues before the Council, especially with regard to sensitive conflicts taking place in their respective regions and elsewhere.

The French initiative points out that the recourse to open debate will be on a case-by-case basis. In other words, it is for the Council to decide whether or not to subject a particular issue to an open debate. This is something we understand, since it is compatible with the fact that the Council is the master of its procedures. However, it is our opinion that this issue deserves further careful study before a decision is taken.

Whatever the case may be, any improvement in the Council's working methods should be formulated in a manner that enables it to carry out its responsibilities for

maintaining peace and security in a prompt and effective manner and in accordance with the circumstances surrounding each situation, as well as in complete adherence to the Charter of the United Nations and the rules and regulations of the Security Council.

In conclusion, my delegation, as a non-permanent member of the Security Council, welcomes once again the French initiative and stands ready to work closely with other members in the future discussions of this matter.

Mr. Yañez-Barneuvo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like at the outset to express to the delegation of France our appreciation for the important initiative it has taken to ensure greater transparency in the Security Council's activities.

A little over a month ago the Security Council, in a presidential statement on 4 November announcing its decision to implement new arrangements for consultations with countries contributing troops to peace-keeping operations, clearly showed that it was determined to adapt its working methods and bring them up to date. In taking that decision the Council gave new momentum to the process of exchanging information with all Member States. In so doing, it was responding, albeit partially, to the general feeling of the Organization's membership — a feeling reiterated by the delegations that spoke in the debate in the Council that took place during the meeting held on 4 November following the reading of the presidential statement — that there was a need for better and more effective communication between members of the Security Council and the other States Members of the Organization.

I have mentioned the process of adaptation, because the presidential statement of 4 November and the other significant progress that had been achieved over the preceding months were part of a move towards transparency that had its beginnings in decisions taken by the Security Council on 30 June 1993. I am happy to refer to this because at that time Spain was President of the Council. This series of decisions, which were procedural and operational in nature, were ultimately aimed at creating, in a pragmatic and flexible manner, greater transparency and flexibility in the work of the Council. All of this leads to an increase in the legitimacy and credibility of the Security Council in the eyes of Member States, on whose behalf, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter, the Council acts, and, ultimately, to greater effectiveness of its decisions.

With this in mind, the Spanish delegation welcomes France's proposal that we place greater emphasis on public debate in the Security Council's work. This proposal would require a new phase to be initiated in this process. My delegation views favourably the ideas contained in the *aide-mémoire* distributed by the Permanent Representative of France with his letter dated 9 November 1994 addressed to the Secretary-General, and we fully support the spirit underlying this initiative.

France's *aide-mémoire* addresses the two principal means of exchanges of information in the relationship between the Security Council and the rest of the membership of the Organization, including other members of the international community. On the one hand, the idea of holding public orientation debates, open to the participation of all Members of the Organization at the beginning of the consideration of a new item or when there is to be an important debate, would seem to be the most effective way of ensuring a broad exchange of views that could lay the groundwork for subsequent action by the Security Council. Unquestionably, this greater participation of States Members of the Organization in the deliberation process — especially the participation of those States most directly affected by a situation under consideration by the Council — would serve to make clear to the Members that the representative nature of the Council and adherence to its decisions were being reinforced.

The second element of France's initiative — that public meetings be convened for exchanges of views between members of the Security Council on a given item — would also require that progress be made towards achieving transparency in the Council's work by establishing a new balance in its present methods of work. The most immediate effect would be to enhance the Council's status in the eyes of the Members of the Organization. In general, we agree that greater public exposure for the Council's activities would in no way undermine the necessity or the usefulness of informal consultations of the members of the Council, which are indispensable to the taking of decisions that are balanced, constructive and capable of commanding the fullest measure of support within the Council.

We are fully confident that the Security Council, on the basis of the ideas submitted by France and with the support of other delegations, will continue to redefine and improve its methods of work during this new stage in the relations between the Council and the full membership of

the Organization. We consider that this process has already begun and is now irreversible.

Mr. Marker (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation welcomes the proposals contained in document S/1994/1279 of 11 November 1994 and congratulates the French delegation on this important initiative. The long-standing practice of informal consultations confined to the members of the Security Council has become almost the sole mechanism for arriving at decisions of the Council. It is a practice which has become institutionalized, and this in turn has led to a consistent demand by the general membership of the United Nations for greater transparency in the work of the Security Council.

The confidentiality of the discussions in the Council has tended to create a somewhat unfortunate impression of secret deals being struck or pressure being brought on non-permanent members by the major Powers to promote their own interests at the expense of the smaller States. Nevertheless, there is a view that confidentiality of exchanges is essential for the decision-making process, including the achievement of consensus, and for the effective dispatch of business of the Security Council. Indeed, much of the new-found effectiveness of the Council can be attributed to the procedure of confidentiality, which provides the climate for free-ranging, sometimes almost uninhibited debates which precede, influence and eventually shape the decisions that finally emerge from the Council's consideration. The informal consultations procedure also possesses the considerable advantage of providing flexibility to delegations during the negotiating process.

The main problem, in our view, is not the institution of informal consultations. It is, rather, the overtly heavy reliance on this mechanism that breeds dissatisfaction among the non-members. It is therefore clear that there is a need to arrive at a realistic balance between transparency and confidentiality, as well as between informal consultations and public or official meetings. The question then is: what represents the ideal or the most viable balance? While, for some, the preference is for confidentiality for others the emphasis is on transparency.

As I have just stated, my delegation does accept the practical utility of informal consultations. Indeed, it would be counterproductive to introduce any innovation which might disrupt the role of these consultations in enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the Council. For instance, the preparation of verbatim or summary records of informal consultations may not be a viable proposition, as it would compromise the principle of confidentiality maintained in informal exchanges. This confidentiality, by, *inter alia*, allowing greater scope for Council members to reach compromises on difficult issues, helps in the efficient functioning of the Council. By the same token, we feel that it is absolutely essential that briefings to the Council by the Secretary-General and the discussions that follow if they are to be at all valuable, should take place only during informal consultations. The same confidentiality would need to be preserved for briefings to the Council on sensitive issues by other officials.

None the less, while seeking greater transparency in the Council's work as well as a better flow of information to non-members, we have to acknowledge in all fairness the improvements already made in this context over the past few years. The many steps taken by the Security Council include the publication of the Council's agenda of work for each day in the United Nations *Journal*; circulation of the monthly forecast of the Council's programme of work to the entire United Nations membership; some improvement in the format of the Security Council's annual report to the General Assembly; the decision to hold meetings between Council members, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat to facilitate exchanges of information prior to important Council decisions on peace-keeping operations; and the latest institution of the Council presidency's giving periodic briefings to non-members of the Council on the work of the Council.

While all these measures have been welcomed, an overwhelming number of United Nations Members remain dissatisfied with the degree of visibility which is currently available to them. Therefore, in the immediate context, we welcome the French proposal for working on two possibilities: orientation debates open to the participation of the entire United Nations membership, and public meetings of the Council without the participation of non-Council Member States.

However, the question of transparency cannot be fully addressed by merely holding orientation and public debates occasionally or even frequently. Other steps that could be taken without compromising the institution of informal consultations are, first, direct consultations between troop-contributing countries and Security Council members, rather than their participation at meetings jointly chaired by the Secretariat and the presidency, especially when taking important decisions affecting a mission; secondly, making the proceedings of the sanctions committees more transparent, especially for

those countries affected directly or indirectly by them; thirdly, a more frequent use of the "Diego Arria format" in order to receive direct inputs from the parties to a conflict or from representatives of different organizations; fourthly, the appointment of a rapporteur, who could attend all Council meetings and could then brief non-members regarding the consultations; and, fifthly, improvements in the working methods of the Security Council by reviewing its provisional rules of procedure, particularly chapters II, VI and IX.

Members of the Council might wish to consider for example, the feasibility of introducing draft resolutions, when deemed appropriate, at a formal meeting of the Security Council. This procedure is being followed in the Committees of the General Assembly and is therefore by no means innovative. Non-members of the Security Council would then have the opportunity to present their views and comments to the sponsor or sponsors of the draft resolution, and these could then be considered in the informal consultation, where the draft resolution would obviously have to be negotiated before it is finally put before the formal meeting for adoption. Obviously, the choice of whether to introduce a draft resolution in a formal session or in informal consultations must rest with the sponsor or sponsors.

The question of transparency should not be addressed in a manner that brings about only cosmetic changes. Transparency is a broader issue, which not only aims to give fuller information to non-members but also to improve the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly. In conclusion, let me say that the French proposal for orientation and public meetings is a step in the right direction, but is just one part of the larger mosaic which is emerging.

Sustained and serious effort would continue to be required to address the other important matters pertaining to the reform and streamlining of the working methods of the Council.

Mr. Keating (New Zealand): New Zealand supports the idea of more public meetings of the Council. We have therefore given public support, in a letter to you, Mr. President, to the French initiative. We have also strongly supported the notion that this issue should be discussed here today. To be blunt, our particular concern in this area is that when consideration of a new issue begins, the party or parties concerned should be able publicly to state their position to the Council before the Council begins consideration of the problem. We recall at least two occasions in the course of this year when States Members of the Organization requested that the Council take up an issue and they very strongly wished the opportunity to present their case to the Council collectively. The Council's procedures, at the time, did not permit that, and it was felt by my delegation to be very unfortunate. So for that reason, more than anything else, we have strongly supported the initiative of the delegation of France.

We, therefore, believe that any decision permitting the Council to hold more open meetings to consider issues at the commencement of the consideration of a new issue should always be a matter of course. In such a matter, we do not believe that it would be acceptable that in some cases the Council would say "yes" and in others it would say "no". There must be no discrimination in such matters and, in particular, no discrimination between cases in which issues are raised by Members that are within the Council and those that are not.

The French proposals are therefore very welcome to my delegation. However, we feel that they do not go quite far enough. As the representative of Pakistan has just said, they are a step towards the necessary transparency. We feel that the Council should go further, and here there are some aspects of the French analysis with which we do not entirely agree. In particular, in the *aide-mémoire*, we have reservations about paragraph 12 on the status of informal consultations, where it is argued that informal consultations do not exist. But to say that they have no legal existence does not, of itself, make that correct. We believe that on this subject, we should look closely at the Articles of the Charter, in particular Articles 31 and 32.

No one in the Council would challenge the fact that decision-making must rest with the Council. The Charter makes that quite clear. It specifies that the participation to be accorded under Articles 31 and 32 is participation without the right to vote. Nor, I think, is anyone saying that the Council cannot or indeed should not meet behind closed doors when necessary. It will probably always be appropriate and necessary to have some private discussion. The question, as so many previous speakers have said, is the appropriate balance. My delegation believes that the current balance is not right. We believe that we have to ask ourselves what the legal outcome might be if a State, or a group of States, party to a dispute, and feeling aggrieved by the fact that they were not invited to participate meaningfully by the Council in

a matter of concern to them, should propose a draft resolution in the General Assembly requesting the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion.

I am not so sure that the answer would accord with the conclusions made in France's *aide-mémoire*. Let us look at Article 32 of the Charter, which says that those States "shall be invited". There is no question of discretion. It is not a matter that the Security Council can refuse. Secondly, they are invited to "participate ... in the discussion". I think to most people, discussion in this context implies participation in the formulation of the conclusions. Certainly, it implies participation at stages prior to finalization. I do not think that rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure particularly helps in this context. It certainly does not help the argument that informal consultations do not exist, because it seems to me that an international tribunal might want to look at the evidence. What is the evidence? Well, first, are these meetings or not? United Nations practice, I think, is a very important consideration, and in fact we have instituted the practice of listing the meetings of informal consultations in the *Journal*. They are listed there under the heading entitled "Scheduled meetings". Certainly editors of the *Journal* believe that the informal consultations are meetings. And then we need to look at other kinds of evidence, like the activity which takes place in informal consultations. Now, many colleagues tonight have referred, in considerable detail, which I will not repeat, to the weighty matters that are considered in informal consultations and the preponderance of the Council's work that takes place in informal consultations. The representative of Brazil referred, I think very clearly, to the important decisions that are taken in informal consultations, not least in the context of reviews under sanctions resolutions. Here we have decisions which are legally mandated in resolutions for the Council to undertake reviews. The Security Council is required to undertake these reviews, and it does so in informal consultations. So there is a great deal of evidence that mandated legal action does actually take place in informal consultations.

These thoughts lead me to the conclusion that the representative of Brazil is absolutely right in saying that there is a need to update the Council's rules of procedure. I would probably disagree with the reasoning he advanced as to why the rules of procedure need clarification, but certainly there is a great deal of ambiguity in our rules at the present time, and I would support his proposal that they be reviewed and clarified in the Working Group in the near future.

Now, to go back to the proposals made by the representative of France, I want to repeat that I think his proposals contain some very useful steps towards transparency, and they complement the important and useful steps that have already been achieved in the course of the last 12 months. We think the Council can take considerable satisfaction in the fact that it is on the right path with measures such as that contained in the statement of 4 November last on consultations with troop-contributing countries and the processes that were outlined in the statement by the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom.

But I do want to underline my strong belief that automaticity in the holding of open meetings at the beginning of the consideration of a new issue, without discrimination, should become a matter of course in this Council. As regards the broader use of open meetings, the consideration of reports of the Secretary-General and the consideration of important presentations such as the one we heard yesterday from the Vice-President of Rwanda, and the one we heard earlier in the year from President Shevardnadze: these have a very important place as regards the transparency of our Council. But these are only first steps on a road along which the Council must travel.

We believe that the United Nations has entered a new era — an era when the Council must not only operate effectively but must be seen to operate transparently and fairly, as envisaged in the Charter. If effectiveness becomes the sole criterion, then we fear that the Council will end up doing effectively less and less, because the Member States on which it relies to provide troops and funding for peace-keeping operations, and on whose behalf it acts, will increasingly withhold their support.

I commend this initiative and I hope that we will be able to take some more steps along this path in the coming year.

Mr. Cárdenas (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: Today the Security Council has, once again, an opportunity to meet and discuss the question of its procedures. Thanks to the proposal set forth by France in the *aide-mémoire* annexed to the letter dated 9 November 1994 and contained in document S/1994/1279, we are able to do so.

The Republic of Argentina attaches great importance to the question of the procedures of the Security Council.

We believe that, through the proper use of these procedures, significant progress can be made towards the objectives of transparency, representativeness, interaction, openness, efficiency and effectiveness on the part of this organ of the United Nations, which bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.

France quite rightly reminds us that rule 48 of the provisional rules of procedure states: "Unless it decides otherwise, the Security Council shall meet in public". France also reminds us that at the present time — and this has been going on for many years — the practice seems to have deviated quite significantly from what is provided for in this rule.

Today it can be stated that a substantial part of the work of the Security Council is carried on in so-called informal consultations, where there are intensive discussions of the matters before the Council. Decisions are proposed, negotiated and agreed upon. In certain cases, although with increasing frequency, decisions are adopted concerning, for instance, letters to be sent by the President, presidential statements, statements to the press, and even the dispatch of Security Council missions to conflict areas or situations.

Some see these informal meetings as actual meetings of the Council, although strictly speaking they are not. This view could perhaps be sustained from the purely formal and legalistic point of view, yet we do not really agree with it. In the opinion of our delegation, the norm, the standard — that is, the provisional rules of procedure of the Council — should always be interpreted in a reasonably broad way, particularly in the light of Article 30 of the Charter and the arguments which the Permanent Representative of New Zealand has just put forward, and with which my delegation concurs.

The French proposal suggests that we make more frequent use of public meetings in three particular cases: the adoption of a resolution or the reading out of a statement; the holding of an orientation debate open to all Members when the Council is taking up a new question or beginning its consideration of an important matter, and public exchanges of views among members of the Security Council.

The Republic of Argentina supports this initiative. It believes that it would be useful to explore the suitability and feasibility of putting into practice the new modalities proposed by France. We recognize that adjusting our current practice may take some time and would require a sincere will to do so.

We believe that we must seek an effective balance between such public meetings and informal consultations, which, in their present form, are enormously useful.

The intense pace of the Council's work over the past four years must prompt us to give careful consideration to the question how best to implement the French proposal. In the context of the foregoing, we believe that we should also reconsider the recent tendency to create working groups of the Council. Here we must proceed in the light, explicitly, of Article 29 of the United Nations Charter. In addition, we must also use special rapporteurs appointed by the Council itself for specific or general matters. We will return to this matter under rule 28 of the provisional rules of procedure in due course.

The question of transparency cannot however be limited to a discussion of what types of meetings the Council should hold, or of what combinations of types of meetings there should be. As my colleagues from Pakistan and New Zealand have said, the attitude taken in this regard has to be based on a certain form of conduct.

This year the Security Council has decided to implement a number of important initiatives concerning this and other matters. These include, *inter alia*, the Council's recent decision to hold meetings with troop-contributing countries and with the Secretariat, in the spirit of Article 44 of the Charter.

We would also like to highlight the decision that the President of the Security Council should report to the membership in general periodically with advance notice, on the results of informal consultations.

The Argentine delegation believes that the progress made, in the form of the procedures that we have just described, will need to be complemented by a series of measures which could contribute to the transparency, representativeness and efficiency of the Council. They might cover the following matters.

First, Article 32 of the Charter states that any Member of the United Nations which is a party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute.

We are well aware that the Council's discussions on a particular dispute almost always take place in informal consultations. Formal debates in which the parties to the conflict may take part have been to date, in general, occasions when decisions are adopted — decisions that have already been made in informal consultations. We believe that this can harm the parties to the conflict, as they must then delegate to another State — a member of the Council — the task of defending their position. The situation becomes even worse when — as has happened — one of the parties is a member of the Security Council and the other is not.

We believe that this might be remedied by inviting the parties in question to participate in the formal meetings, certainly but may be also, to a certain extent and with the corresponding limitations, in the informal discussions. We are, in fact, trying to remedy the situation through measures such as the "Arria" formula. But in our view this is but a palliative, perhaps unsatisfactory, because the real discussion continues to take place elsewhere.

Secondly, there is the question of transparency within the Security Council itself. We refer here to what could be termed "internal" transparency, previously referred to by, for instance, my colleague from Nigeria. After a year in the Council, we consider that information in the Council is not initially distributed in an entirely satisfactory way. This creates a certain inequality in the way in which various delegations can react to a particular issue.

It should be recognized that the Secretariat is making a significant effort to provide the members of the Council with up-to-date information. This effort has repeatedly led to considerable progress, including progress made recently. Nevertheless, we note that the information often reaches the press, during the media briefings held every morning, before it reaches the members of the Council. This should not necessarily be the case. Here it seems to us that attention to the need for transparency to some extent distorts and affects the very work of the Council.

This year, as is clear, the Council has begun a very positive debate on the procedures of the Security Council. The General Assembly has discussed this subject in a number of its forums — in particular, in the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council.

However, in our opinion, it is particularly noteworthy that the Security Council, including its permanent members — as this meeting shows — is prepared to listen very carefully to the message being sent by the membership in general in order to be able to act accordingly. We believe that this — which strengthens our joint work, ensures that a meeting of minds continues and encourages an active approach — is very positive for the Security Council and for its relationship with the membership in general. Its success, however, will ultimately depend on everyone's cooperation. It is not enough just to have an instrument; maximum use must be made of the opportunity that it provides.

The Argentine Republic is determined to continue to contribute to this process, which — through participation — aims to strengthen the Security Council and thereby enable it fully to discharge its responsibilities in an international context that requires ever greater efforts.

Mr. Olhaye (Djibouti): My delegation is very appreciative of the thoughtful initiative taken by the French delegation on the important issue of transparency in the work of the Security Council. In fact, it was during his statement before the General Assembly in September this year that the Foreign Minister of France, Mr. Alain Juppé, put forward constructive ideas, subsequently introduced in the Security Council by Ambassador Mérimée of France.

The focus of this initiative, which we fully welcome, is the feeling among many delegations that the working methods of the Council should allow for greater transparency. And it is in the light of the timely and crucial relevance of this matter that members of the Security Council deemed it proper to solicit the views of the wider membership of the United Nations on what must transpire in the functions of a "transparent Council". Today it is the "consumers" who must voice his concerns with the "product" — either with its content or its delivery, or both.

And there can be little doubt that the consumer — that is, the general membership of the United Nations — has invariably voiced concern over transparency in the Security Council. For the Council is correctly perceived as the locus of international efforts not only to forge collective action and restrain hostilities between States, as in the past, but in large measure, as well, to concern itself with the international humanitarian rights of communities and individuals within States. This expanded role of the United Nations system and the Council has become the key to a rational world order, raising

concerns among smaller States and regions and about international priorities other than just the self-interest of a few.

Clearly, the issue of transparency is complex. In one sense, perhaps, that which is least transparent is the meaning to be attached to transparency itself. There may be as many definitions of transparency as there are Members of the United Nations, and we must begin to narrow the concept down sufficiently if we are to give it relevance and usefulness. Recently, for example, the Council received a joint letter from the delegations of New Zealand and Argentina on ways to increase the transparency of peace-keeping operations, particularly for troop-contributing countries. This is certainly a vital area of transparency, as is the suggestion contained in the French initiative for a better balance of public and private meetings and greater participation by other members.

Unfortunately, other Council members will no doubt come forward with additional proposals of their own, which may in the end inadvertently contribute to the erection of an edifice unrecognizable to anyone or that is not at all what we wanted — that is, transparent. We may discover we are merely taking symbolic steps toward an undefined goal — in fact, improvising and innovating in a piecemeal, ad hoc fashion. The concern of my delegation, therefore, is whether this 'building block' approach to constructing or reaching transparency will be sufficient or effective. Will the end product merely constrain us further? Are there unforeseen limitations to transparency we would be well advised to recognize?

It is important as well not to overlook the presumed stature, privacy and uniqueness of the Council. In the effort to achieve transparency, will the Council's independence and privacy be violated or compromised, its "mystique" or "magic" reduced? Significant progress has already been made in opening up procedures and deliberations to non-members — a fact which cannot be overlooked. Some members have been quite effective in expanding the two-way flow of information from the Council to States in their region, and in fact to the wider membership of the United Nations, while also strengthening the consideration by the Council of the feelings, concerns and suggestions of the States in their region and of this wider membership. In this regard, my delegation has worked diligently to maintain this flow and dialogue with a great number of countries. We believe wider and more effective use of this device would contribute considerably to the achievement of transparency, particularly should the Council decide to hold regular "proximity talks" with countries of a specific region on matters before the Council that are of particular interest to them.

Overall, we must reach the wider membership and provide it with the access, input and transparency it requires. The task is to define the exact nature of that transparency, one which is adequate for the needs of the general, regional or designated membership, including troop-contributing countries, while preserving the efficiency, effectiveness, openness and prestige of the Council.

These are weighty matters, and my delegation feels they deserve a concerted and serious effort by the Council to resolve them. With further exploration and examination by the Council's Working Group on documentation and procedure, we can expect the issue to be given much needed clarification, refinement and momentum, taking into consideration the views of the total membership of the Council. In this way we should arrive at a clearer and more comprehensive understanding of transparency and determine what it will mean in practice. The Council has come a long way in penetrating the maze which has surrounded transparency in concept and in practice, and my delegation feels that, if it continues its efforts in a purposeful and organized manner, many benefits will accrue to all.

Mr. Rovensky (Czech Republic): My delegation shares the view expressed by a number of preceding speakers that some of the working methods of the Security Council are outdated and should be revised in order to enhance efficiency and achieve greater transparency in the Council's decision-making process. We are also aware of the fair amount of criticism levelled by Member States at the Security Council's mode of operation, which is viewed as unnecessarily rigid and secretive.

On the other hand, we believe that over the past year the Security Council has responded, at least to some degree, to this criticism and addressed the issue of greater transparency in its activities. The practice of regular briefings by the President of the Security Council to non-Council members on the work of the Council has been introduced. There are regular meetings between troop contributors, members of the Security Council and representatives of the Secretariat.

Although these steps go in the right direction, they are obviously not sufficient. Further effort is needed to

make the routine of the Security Council less rigid, more transparent and, from the point of view of many non-Council members, more democratic.

My delegation therefore welcomes the *aide-mémoire* prepared by the delegation of France, which contains several interesting proposals for increasing transparency in the work of the Security Council. As a non-permanent member of the Council, we wholeheartedly welcome the prospect of appropriate provisions of the Charter and the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council being used to the full extent to facilitate broader exchanges of views between Council members and non-Council members on important issues of international peace and security. In this context, we view most of the suggestions put forward by the French delegation as useful and worthy of consideration.

At the same time, we believe that it is imperative that the right balance be struck between the legitimate goal of greater transparency, on the one hand, and the equally important principle of efficiency and effectiveness, on the other. The Security Council's efficiency and effectiveness should, if anything, be improved by the envisaged changes.

My delegation is therefore of the view that formal meetings of the Security Council with the participation of non-Council members should be convened primarily to debate key issues, such as emergency situations threatening international peace and security or important decisions concerning peace-keeping operations. In this connection, we agree with the statement in the French proposal where it states that there is no question of establishing automaticity in the convening of these meetings.

The well-established practice of informal consultations, criticized though it is by some non-Council members, has proved its usefulness and, in the view of my delegation, should be preserved in its present form.

Finally, let me express my delegation's conviction that the views and recommendations which will emerge from today's deliberations will contribute greatly towards finding the right approaches and mechanisms for enhancing effectiveness and transparency in the work of the Security Council. This would in turn, without any doubt, boost the prestige of the Security Council in the eyes of the broad membership of the United Nations.

Mr. Hume (United States of America): The United States welcomes the proposal to explore opportunities to make greater use of public meetings of the Security Council, including meetings at which non-members offer views on matters under consideration. This idea is a further important step in the Security Council's efforts to reform its working methods and procedures in order to make them more transparent, and to broaden and regularize opportunities for non-members to contribute to its work. The proposal before us builds on many innovations in Council procedure introduced over the last 18 months, including, most recently, consultations between troop contributors, Council members and the Secretariat on changes in peace-keeping mandates and the now-weekly briefings of non-members on Council business.

At the same time, the United States delegation recalls that it is important for the Council to proceed cautiously when it decides how to structure its consideration of each matter before it. In particular, the form of Council deliberations should not compromise their function, which remains to achieve agreement in an expeditious manner on matters before it. With this proviso, we look forward to pursuing opportunities, on a case-by-case basis, to employ public meetings in the Council's consideration of its work.

Mr. Fulci (Italy): Since this is the first time I am addressing the Security Council under your presidency, Sir, I wish first of all to express my country's great and sincere appreciation for your balance and wisdom as you guide the Council's work during the month of December.

We read with interest the French *aide-mémoire* on the Security Council's working methods. As members know, my country has tried to play an active role in the current debate in the Open-Ended Working Group on the reform of the Council. In that context, we have repeatedly underlined the special importance we attach to "other matters" pertaining to the reform of the Council, aside from the question of its enlargement.

For this reason, we welcome this contribution from one of the permanent members, France, and the recognition implied in it of the need to lend greater transparency to the Council's work. We totally agree that vigour must be restored to rule 48 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure, which provides that:

> "Unless it decides otherwise, the Security Council shall meet in public."

This rule has fallen into disuse. Instead, closed-door informal consultations with no records have been

preferred. Now it seems to us that the time has come to reaffirm rule 48 and to re-establish the proper relationship between the rule — public meetings — and the exception — informal consultations.

We therefore hope that the Security Council will give concrete follow-up to the French proposals by holding more frequent public meetings. Currently there is only one case in which the Security Council must meet in public: the almost liturgical meetings for the adoption of resolutions or presidential statements. To this the French *aide-mémoire* would add two new cases: orientation debates, open to all Member States, on new questions coming up for the Council's consideration; and public exchanges of views between members of the Council on specific issues.

In our view, the first formula is of special interest. For example, it would allow countries capable of and willing to contribute troops to a peace-keeping operation to participate directly in the Council's initial debates on that operation, including the definition of the mandate that their troops would be called upon to fulfil. Italy is very sensitive to this issue, especially after our difficult experience in Somalia. That is why we warmly welcomed the recent initiatives of Argentina and New Zealand regarding this form of participation.

While, as I have said, we share and support the substance of France's proposals, we would not want them to be used as an alternative to or a substitute for more regular, systematic and comprehensive information on the Council's informal consultations. During the debate in the Working Group on reform, we have often brought up the need for such information.

If, on the one hand, we agree with the usefulness — and perhaps the inevitability, given the often crucial role of confidentiality — of informal consultations within the Council to develop its orientations and decisions, we want, on the other hand, to re-emphasize the necessity of prompt, constant and detailed briefings, possibly by the President of the Security Council or a member of the presidential delegation, for the sake of greater transparency. The President could possibly, if judged necessary, be assisted by representatives of the prior and succeeding Presidents, according to the "troika" formula that has become a time-honoured practice in the European Union and more recently in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). In fact, our capitals have every right to expect speedy and reliable information on the Council's orientations towards the main problems within its competence and on every phase of the debate, even debates that will probably continue to take place through informal consultations. Needless to say, this demand is not met by the fragmentary information now dispensed, which is left entirely up to the good will of individual colleagues from countries sitting on the Council — to whom, of course, we are nevertheless most grateful. Without their help we would often have been left completely in the dark about what was happening in the adjoining consultations room.

That is the reason why, in our view,

> "disseminating of the content of the discussion in informal meetings" (*S/1994/1279, annex, para. 9*),

to use the very words of the French document, is an essential requirement for true transparency and for genuine reform of the Council's working methods.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Italy for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Denmark. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Haakonsen (Denmark): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the Nordic countries: Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark.

The Nordic countries welcome the proposals presented by France concerning the working methods of the Security Council, which appear in document S/1994/1279 of 11 November 1994. We also welcome the initiative to make the French proposals the object of a Security Council meeting in which non-members of the Council too have been given an opportunity to express their views.

The French proposals and the convening of this meeting are evidence of a growing awareness of the need to achieve greater transparency in the work of the Security Council. As pointed out in the French *aide-mémoire*, greater transparency in the work of the Security Council can be achieved in two ways: either by giving non-members of the Council greater access to information concerning the informal consultations undertaken within the Council or by more frequent public meetings of the Council. The Nordic countries consider that both approaches should be followed.

With regard to information on informal consultations, we appreciate the steps already taken. We welcome the newly established practice whereby the President of the Council regularly holds information meetings for non-members. We realize that these meetings must have their limits, but we think that they could be further developed. We wish to stress that it is up to the non-members to take full advantage of this new opportunity of getting access to information on the informal consultations by encouraging an enhanced dialogue through active participation in the briefings.

With regard to the question of holding more public meetings of the Security Council, the Nordic countries concur with the view that not much would be achieved by simply having more meetings of the kind we know today. The public meetings need to be organized in a different manner. In the French *aide-mémoire* two new types of meetings are proposed: orientation debates, open to all States Members of the United Nations; and public exchanges of views between members of the Security Council.

The Nordic countries would like to express their preference for meetings of the first type — the orientation debates. It is suggested in the *aide-mémoire* that the Council, in taking up a new question or beginning its consideration of an important matter, should call on non-members, at their request, for the purpose of hearing their views on the subject and discussing with them possible courses of action. The Nordic countries would welcome such orientation debates. However, we are of the view that they should take place not just at the beginning of the Council's consideration of an item. Debates in which non-members participated could also serve a useful purpose at later stages in the Council's deliberations.

We are somewhat concerned, however, that in the formal setting of the Security Council such orientation debates could turn out to be rather formal affairs. It is important, therefore, that there should be a genuine dialogue, and not just the reading of prepared statements. If implemented in this manner, the French proposal could provide us with a useful tool.

The Nordic countries also look forward to the possibility of the Council's holding public meetings for exchanges of views between Council members on matters that lend themselves to this approach.

When discussing the proposals under consideration we must, of course, recognize the need to ensure that the work load of the Security Council — and, for that matter, of the non-members — is not increased unnecessarily. The French paper states that we must strike the right balance between the requirements of publicity and those of efficiency. The Nordic countries agree with that. I wish merely to add that openness and efficiency are not necessarily poles apart.

Finally, I want to underline that the Nordic countries see the French proposals as supplementary to, and not as substitutes for, the arrangements for consultations between troop-contributing countries, members of the Security Council and the Secretariat, in accordance with the modalities set out in the presidential statement of 4 November 1994. The representative of France has just confirmed this understanding.

An enhanced dialogue on peace-keeping operations would, in our view, improve the efficiency of the operations. The consultations with troop-contributors should be structured, should be focused on areas of particular concern and should take place on a regular basis, as well as when extensions and/or modifications of existing mandates are being considered. Whenever possible, the Security Council should also consult with potential troop-contributors before taking a decision to launch a new peace-keeping operation.

The President *(interpretation from French)*: The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Batu (Turkey): It gives me great pleasure to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I am confident that under your able guidance the Council will carry out its responsibilities successfully. I should like also to pay tribute to Ambassador Albright of the United States of America for the remarkable manner in which she conducted the work of the Council in November.

The ending of the cold war freed the Security Council from political constraints and enabled it to assume a vastly expanded role. The work load of the Council has increased tremendously. However, there is a new challenge ahead of us: we must make the Council more transparent, accountable and democratic. This, in turn, will necessitate genuine reform, including changes in the composition of the Council and in its working methods and procedures to reflect the spirit of

democratization. With these thoughts in mind, we have been actively participating in the deliberations of the Open-Ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council.

At meetings of the General Assembly and of the open-ended Working Group we have repeatedly expressed our views regarding transparency in and democratization of the Council's decision-making process. In the open-ended Working Group's next round of deliberations we shall continue to dwell in detail on this issue.

It is against this background that we welcome the initiative of France, which is set out in the Document S/1994/1279. We support its main thrust. Indeed, it is the common desire of the vast majority of Member States that the Council should hold more public debates and meetings.

Under Article 25 of Charter, the Member States agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. This makes the Council unique within the United Nations system. The authority of Security Council decisions emanates from the fact that the Council, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter, acts on behalf of all Members of the United Nations. For that reason it is essential that Council decisions be in accord with the views of the general membership.

The fact that Council resolutions must have an adequate consensual base is also inherent in the letter and spirit of paragraph 4 of Article 1 of the Charter, which lists "harmonizing the actions of nations" as one of the purposes of the United Nations. Therefore, a credible and workable mechanism for dialogue between the Council and the general membership should be devised. This would enable the general membership to participate, where and if necessary, in the Council's decision-making process.

To this effect, we support the proposal contained in subparagraph (a) of the paragraph 3 of the *aide-mémoire* concerning the holding of

> "Orientation debates open to all members of the Organization". *(S/1994/1279, annex, para. 3)*

We believe that such meetings should be held not just when the Council is preparing to begin consideration of an important question but also before it takes action on that question. Thus, the decision would more adequately reflect the will of the general membership.

Half a century after their adoption, the Security Council's rules of procedure are still provisional. The Council's current working methods rely heavily on the vague formulation set out in rule 48 of this still-provisional text. I refer to the phrase "unless it decides otherwise". These four words have become the Council's real rules of procedure. The closed, informal consultations established on the basis of these words should be reviewed and, if necessary, defined properly.

Given the growing number of actions taken under Chapter VII of the Charter, the absence of efficient consultation mechanisms and the secrecy in the Council's decision-making are causing great concern among the general membership.

In this context, I should like to refer especially to the imposition and review of economic sanctions. As all Member States must comply with sanctions imposed by the United Nations, the decision-making and review processes thereon must be totally transparent. If they are to be effective, sanctions regimes must have the full cooperation of Member States. The successful implementation of sanctions can be ensured only through great sacrifice on the part of the countries that are most affected. It is therefore difficult to understand why existing sanction regimes are reviewed in closed, informal consultations.

At this point, I should like to make a concrete proposal. We request that the Council consider reviewing existing sanction regimes in public meetings with open debate. In this vein, it is Turkey's considered opinion that the sanctions committees should also conduct its deliberations in public meetings. We strongly believe that openness in the activities of the Council with respect to sanctions would make the system more just and fair, thus strengthening international support for economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations.

On the other hand, the current practice shows that a great many Council actions are based on the information provided orally by the Secretariat during closed informal consultations. In order to enable the general membership to better conceive of the motives of the action in question, these oral briefings should be circulated in written form.

The paramount urgency of reviewing the transparency of the working methods of the Security Council is best summed up at the conclusion of the French *aide-mémoire*. It says,

> "It will thus strengthen the link of confidence which ought to bind it to those on behalf of whom it is supposed to act." (*S/1994/1279, para. 19*)

Indeed, acting on behalf of the general membership, the Security Council has the primary responsibility for maintaining the confidence of the Members and maintaining the Council's accountability in their eyes as regards its decision-making process. This would no doubt enhance the moral authority of the Council and contribute to its effectiveness in terms of genuine support for the implementation of its decisions.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Turkey for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Austria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sucharipa (Austria) (*interpretation from French*): Allow me first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on the effectiveness you have shown in your conduct of the affairs of the Security Council as its President for the month of December.

By the presidential statement issued last 4 November, the Security Council decided to enhance the possibilities of communication between the Council and troop-contributing countries. Although that decision embraced the original proposals only in a limited fashion, my delegation appreciated it and will follow very closely its implementation in practice.

Today we welcome the initiative taken by the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, which is reflected in the *aide-mémoire* presented by the Permanent Representative of France to the Security Council on 11 November. We consider it, along with the other relevant initiatives taken last week, a serious attempt to adapt the working methods of the Security Council to the democratic requirements of the Organization. We appreciate today's open debate on the possible structure of future debates. In philosophical terms, I think that today we are engaged in a "meta-debate".

Maintaining international peace and security and, to that end, taking effective collective action are among the main objectives, if not the main objective, of the United Nations. The authors of the Charter conferred the principal responsibility for this task on the Security Council in order to ensure swift and effective action.

On the other hand, it was certainly not the intention of the authors of the Charter to exclude the Members of the Organization totally from the elaboration of positions on questions of fundamental political importance while obliging them to implement decisions taken by the Security Council. Articles 31 and 32 suggest, rather, the contrary. It is therefore imperative to find a balance between the need for swift and effective decision-making and the need to give all Member States concerned the opportunity to make themselves heard at an appropriate time, thus ensuring that their opinions are taken into account by the Security Council when decisions are formulated and taken.

In this context, the French proposal deserves serious examination. With Cartesian logic it discusses the dilemma inherent in most attempts to improve the interaction between the Council and the States non-members of the Council.

The French *aide-mémoire* proposes

> "Orientation debates open to all Members of the Organization at a time when the Council is preparing to begin consideration of an important question". (*A/1994/1279, para. 3 (a)*).

In our view, the key elements of this carefully drafted proposal consist of the "debate", which encompasses exchanges of views, and the organization of the debates at the beginning of the Council's consideration of an important question.

Addressing the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic declared that France was in favour of the Council's holding formal meetings to listen to the Members of the Organization and to engage in dialogue with them, without renouncing the formula of informal consultations. "Engage in dialogue" clearly implies interaction, which requires responsibility and self-restraint on the part of the States non-members of the Council. In order to guarantee a viable procedure, active participation must therefore be limited to delegations that have a specific interest in a given subject.

We hope that the open debates will be considered a useful exercise, not an additional burden on the Council in the performance of its tasks. Indeed, the proposal in

paragraph 3 (a) of the French *aide-mémoire* could contribute to more efficient decision-making by the Security Council and could also contribute to increasing the political will of Governments to implement decisions of the Council.

Furthermore, we consider the proposal in paragraph 3 (b) another element aimed at enhancing the transparency of the Security Council. Again, the appropriate balance must be found between public exchanges of views and the necessary negotiations behind closed doors.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the French initiative must also, to a certain extent, be considered a result of the proposals and debates in the framework of the General Assembly's Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council. We await with interest the forthcoming meetings of that Working Group, which, we hope, will provide in particular a better understanding of how the working methods of the Security Council can be improved.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Austria for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Indonesia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Wibisono (Indonesia): I should like first to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December.

It is a distinct honour and privilege for me to make this statement on behalf of the non-aligned countries on an issue to which the Non-Aligned Movement attaches great importance, namely, the Security Council's working methods and procedure.

The Non-Aligned Movement has repeatedly called for a reform of the Security Council in terms of both its composition and its working methods. In this context, we welcome the initiative by France, a permanent member of the Security Council, which responds to the demand for greater transparency and democratization as well as for greater participation in the decision-making process in the Council's work by recourse to public debates, which have fallen into disuse in recent years. In fact, the Cairo Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement specifically called for an increased number of both formal and open meetings prior to the adoption of decisions, thereby allowing for the widest participation of States in the work of the Council. We hope that this is the beginning of a more meaningful dialogue between members of the Council and non-members. This debate today has necessarily to be part of the consideration of the wider issue of reform of the Security Council, which the Non-Aligned Movement has espoused.

The proposal under consideration, namely, reliance on public debate in reaching decisions in the Security Council, is particularly important since, pursuant to Article 24, paragraph 1, of the Charter, the Council acts on behalf of the entire membership and is thus accountable to it. The spirit of transparency and the need for democratic functioning demand not just public meetings of the Council or striking the right balance between the requirements of publicity and efficiency, but effective consultations with the general membership before decisions are taken that are binding on the entire membership. The decision-making should refer to the totality of the Council's functioning, and consultations must become a regular feature. The exact modality of such consultations may need to be flexible so that the Council's ability to take speedy decisions, when so warranted, is not in any way impaired.

The orientation debate proposed by France, allowing wide participation by States Members of the Organization in order to express their views on a subject as well as to discuss possible courses of action, would suggest that the articulation of the common interest of the Members of the Organization as a whole would be feasible. However, the proposal follows a number of measures that have been adopted by the Security Council on the initiative of its members. The listing of the agenda of informal consultations in the *Journal*, the circulation of monthly forecasts of the work of the Council, the briefings by the President for the general membership and efforts towards consultations between the members of the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat have indeed all contributed towards a greater involvement of the general membership in the work of the Council. Those measures are in line with the aspirations of Member States, including the non-aligned countries. We would suggest, however, that these measures be institutionalized and not left to the inclinations and preferences of individuals. The non-aligned countries would also like to underscore the need to make Article 50 of the Charter operational. In this regard, it is necessary to institutionalize the consultations envisaged in that Article as well as to adopt

other effective measures to enable non-members that have the right to do so to consult the Security Council with regard to a solution of those problems.

Furthermore, as called for in the communiqué of the Cairo Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Security Council should take appropriate measures to allow for the participation of interested non-members in any mechanism, such as ad-hoc subsidiary bodies the Council might set up to assist it in dealing with specific matters under its consideration.

The French proposal, along with a number of other measures already adopted, represents a step forward in the process of the comprehensive reform of the Security Council. But the competent body which should deal with the whole question of the reform of the Council in an integrated manner is the General Assembly itself. Partial measures, however laudable, cannot be a substitute for the reform initiated by the General Assembly. An open-ended Working Group of the General Assembly is holding discussions on the entire package relating to equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council. That Group has already reported that there is a convergence of views on the idea that the membership of the Council should be enlarged and that the scope and nature of such enlargement should be discussed further. As regards working methods and procedures, the Working Group has recognized that further measures are necessary to enhance transparency and to reflect the democratic aspirations of the vast majority of Member States.

The Non-Aligned Movement is at present engaged in framing proposals that would lead to a constructive relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council. Among these are the proposal that the annual report of the Security Council to the General Assembly should be much more informative and analytical and that special reports to the Assembly should be provided, as foreseen by the Charter, on issues of critical political importance. This would allow the General Assembly, in its capacity as the only universal body of the United Nations, to consider issues contained in the report and to provide the necessary recommendations to the Council.

By the same token, the provisions contained in Article 12 of the Charter should be made more liberal. In this connection, the authority and credibility of the Council would obviously profit from ascertaining that there is a broad consensus of the general membership of the United Nations, as represented in the General Assembly, on a particular course of action proposed by the Council.

On the other hand, the practice of holding consultations between the Presidents of the Security Council and the General Assembly or their representatives should be institutionalized, thereby allowing for a more effective flow of information between these two principal organs. In addition, the President of the Council could conduct briefings for the Assembly on issues of an urgent political nature, either concurrently with a corresponding special report by the Council or in lieu of one.

The problem with decisions' being taken in informal consultations of the whole will remain even if this important French initiative is adopted. Hence, a number of measures could be taken to resolve this problem, such as, for example, the establishment of structured and institutionalized briefings by the President of the Security Council, or his or her representative, on the results of informal consultations, and the publishing of highlights of the main contents of those consultations. The briefings that are now occasionally held, even if they constitute a step forward, are generally sketchy and provide little or no information other than that appearing in the official documents of the Council. These proposals would be presented to the Working Group for its consideration.

While welcoming the French and other efforts which are in the right direction, I should like to conclude by expressing the hope of the Non-Aligned Movement that its more far-reaching proposals for reform will be given full consideration by the entire membership of the United Nations in the open-ended Working Group.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Indonesia for the kind words he addressed to me.

I should like to inform the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Omar Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*interpretation from French*): The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Karsgaard (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): I wish at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for December. I also wish to thank your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the United States, who presided over the Council last month and has once again taken useful steps to increase the transparency of the Council's work.

My Government welcomes France's initiative aimed at encouraging the Security Council to make greater use of public debate in its decision-making process. We wish to express our support for the procedures proposed in France's *aide-mémoire*. This is a step in the right direction. This initiative falls squarely within the context of many reforms which the Security Council has recently brought to its working methods, in terms both of transparency and of increased consultations with States non-members of the Council. Moreover, the presidential statement of 4 November on consultations with troop-contributing countries, which was rapidly implemented, has already proved to be extremely useful.

(*Spoke in English*)

My delegation has always recognized the need for informal consultations to ensure prompt and effective action by the Security Council. And this requirement clearly continues to apply. But we share the view expressed by France and many others that there often seems to be little justification for not airing publicly the positions of Council members on a given issue. Member States will provide more active support for the Council's decisions if they are better informed of the reasons leading to such decisions. Unnecessary secrecy could, over time, risk eroding the support of the general membership for the Council's actions.

We would also welcome greater opportunity for interested Member States to address the Council on issues of relevance to them, in particular at the outset of the consideration of such issues. We hope that this can be managed without adding unduly to the Council's already charged agenda. There is always, of course, the risk of the Council's being faced with an endless list of speakers each time there is an open debate. We are confident, however, that Member States will limit themselves to speaking on issues of direct concern to them and that the practice of a State speaking on behalf of other States will develop further.

We strongly believe that the implementation of the French proposal will have a significant and positive impact. The ability of Member States to promote their own views and to analyse the rationale of Council decisions will enhance the credibility of those decisions. More open proceedings will also increase the general public's understanding of a vital part of the work of our Organization.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Canada for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Let me first congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December.

My delegation is pleased to note the proposal made by the representative of France aimed at increasing the role of the general membership of the Organization in the Security Council's decision-making process. This is a welcome beginning to rethinking the legitimacy and wisdom of a practice that was established by the Security Council so that it might rely on secrecy as much as it could get away with. This secrecy has been aimed not only at the general membership but also at parties directly involved in an issue which the Council was debating behind closed doors. Assuming for the sake of argument that the former may sometimes be necessary for practical purposes, my delegation fails to see any rational justification for the latter.

My delegation has experienced first-hand the absolute frustration that accompanies the Security Council's secretive practice of deliberating an issue in which my country was directly involved. Contrary to the proposition that attempts to justify Security Council secrecy under the guise of efficiency, our own experience, which is now public knowledge, points only to the expediency and political considerations of a few

members of the Council. In our view, secrecy breeds suspicion and erodes the confidence of the general membership — the very two courses which the Security Council should avoid if it seeks to uphold its authority and refrain from high-handed practices.

Various proposals have been made to remedy the practices of the Security Council. The reforms that have so far been implemented — such as announcing informal meetings in the *Journal* or a few briefings by the President of the Security Council or his or her representative, particularly as this has been carried out to date — are merely cosmetic.

The French delegation has proposed two formulas to strike a better balance between official meetings and informal consultations. Firstly, it proposes holding formal meetings of the Council when the Council seeks to begin its consideration of an important question, in order to allow Members of the Organization to engage in what it calls orientation debates. The second formula, if we have understood it correctly, is based on a constitutional issue: the rule requiring meetings to be held publicly and that informal meetings be exceptions which require an overriding justification. Of course, in its paragraph 16, the French document (S/1994/1279) elaborates this principle in a restrictive fashion. In this connection, I wish to underline rule 48 of the Security Council's provisional rules of procedure, which reads as follows:

> "Unless it decides otherwise, the Security Council shall meet in public".

We hope that these proposals are not seen as all-inclusive. In addition to the proposals, which need to be elaborated and made operational, there are others that should be considered in conjunction with them, if we are to remedy the problem. Some of the ideas to be considered by the Security Council are that: first, the Council should hold open formal meetings unless, in exceptional circumstances, informal meetings are justified; secondly, the Council should consider inviting parties to a conflict to the informal consultation of the whole on the question, as discussed in the Security Council; thirdly, the Council should circulate the written summary of the main contents of its informal consultations to the general membership; fourthly, the Security Council should consider establishing regular, structured, and substantive briefings for the general membership, on the results of its informal consultations; and, fifthly, an effective mechanism could be established for informing non-members of the Council of an emergency and/or weekend meeting of the Council.

If the Security Council adopts a restrictive approach to the important question of transparency and limits itself merely to consideration of the welcome proposals made by France, then to say that the Security Council was ready to "come to its maturity" would be unwarranted flattery — "early adolescence", maybe!

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Owada (Japan): At the outset, I should like, Sir, to extend my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of December. My congratulations also go to Ambassador Albright, who guided the work of the Council so efficiently as its President for the month of November.

Japan welcomes the initiative of the Council to convene this meeting to discuss the Security Council's working methods and procedures.

With the end of the cold war, the role and the responsibility of the Security Council with regard to maintaining international peace and security has increased dramatically. The Council has come to devote an enormous amount of time to deliberations on issues relating to this field and has adopted many resolutions thereon. In particular, the numerous peace-keeping operations it has established in recent years are eloquent testimony to the central importance that the Council attaches to the field of peace and security. My delegation believes that the new emphasis on the role of the Security Council is in itself a welcome development, to the extent that it is a reflection of the new reality of the world in which the United Nations, and in particular its Security Council, should be a central organ in the maintenance of international order.

As the role of the Council has grown, however, the need to reform its composition and to improve its working methods and procedures has become increasingly important. In this context, Japan notes with keen interest that intensive discussions have been taking place in a number of forums on the question of Security Council reform. Japan has itself been an active participant in these discussions.

With respect to working methods and procedures, Japan has been cooperating with other like-minded countries in making a number of proposals with a view to enhancing the transparency of the Council and to fostering dialogue between the Council and non-members of the Council, and between the Council and the General Assembly.

From this viewpoint, Japan notes with appreciation that a number of important steps have recently been taken to improve the functioning and transparency of the Security Council. For instance, last year the Council decided to make a tentative forecast of the monthly programme of its work available to all United Nations Member States. As a member of the Council at that time, Japan strongly supported this decision. The Council has also decided to include the agenda of each informal meeting in the *Journal* and to make the text of draft resolutions in their provisional form available to non-members of the Council. In addition, the President has recently taken steps to hold periodic briefings for non-members of the Council to give them the gist of the informal meetings that have taken place. With regard to peace-keeping operations, the Council has also decided to hold meetings between the Council members, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat in order to establish a consultation mechanism between the three. Japan values these endeavours as an effort to help facilitate a two-way flow of information between members and non-members of the Council.

It is in this spirit that my country welcomes the initiative taken by France to increase the number of formal meetings on certain issues in order to enhance transparency in the work of the Council and to facilitate interaction between the Council and the Member States at large. It is Japan's considered view that informal consultations are extremely important — I would say even essential — if the Council is to function efficiently as a body for genuine consultation and negotiation in a position to arrive at a decision which can be truly effective in coping with a crisis situation. At the same time, however, the official meetings of the Security Council should not be regarded as simply a perfunctory forum for rubber-stamping a decision that has been worked out informally. The visibility of the Security Council in the public eye as the executive organ of the international community taking worthwhile decisions with determination, effectiveness and wisdom is crucial to ensuring the legitimacy and credibility of the Council.

In the view of Japan, an improvement in the working methods and functioning of the Security Council, together with a reform of its membership, should constitute the basis of an overall reform to enhance the legitimacy and credibility of this crucial organ of the United Nations. Japan strongly hopes that consideration of the working methods and functioning of the Security Council, taking into account the French proposal, will be vigorously pursued by the membership of the Security Council and by the Open-ended Working Group on the reform of the Security Council. I am confident that an improvement in this respect, to be achieved in a timely manner, will contribute greatly to the enhancement of the effectiveness of the Security Council and of the Organization.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Japan for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Poland. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Wlosowicz (Poland): I should like to begin my brief statement by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. May I also express our thanks and respect to your predecessor, Ambassador Madeleine Albright, for her achievements as President of the Council for the month of November.

The Polish delegation welcomes the Security Council's willingness to keep the issue of the transparency of its work under consideration. With the framework for the consultations on peace-keeping operations having been recently agreed upon, today's debate represents yet another reaction to the views expressed by Member States concerning the working methods and procedures of the Security Council.

It is significant that the Council itself has been actively searching for ways to allow non-members a greater involvement in the decision-making process. Since we are only at the beginning of this path, this approach is encouraging. It will also enhance a favourable climate for the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation On and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council, which is about to resume its work.

The Polish delegation fully supports the initiative of the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, Mr. Alain Juppé, to increase the role of the general membership in the Security Council's debates. In today's world, which is becoming more and more complex, the

Council might find it difficult to cope with its workload without resorting, should the need arise, to other countries' experience and views.

An "orientation debate", as proposed by the French delegation, seems to be both an appropriate forum for non-members to be heard as well as an instrument to provide the Council members with information they may need. It would also allow all participants in the debate better to understand the respective positions and constraints they have to reckon with. In our view, an "orientation debate" should be a two-way street, equally important for members of the Council and the rest of the United Nations membership.

The second idea put forward by the French delegation also draws appropriate conclusions from what the Member States have been stating for a considerable period of time. We welcome the possibility of replacing some of the informal meetings with a public debate of the Security Council. The next step might be recourse by the Council to the views of the general membership at this stage.

We understand very well and share the aspirations of the members of the international community to participate fully in United Nations activities. The Polish delegation has been supporting the initiatives aimed at devising and implementing relevant changes in the Organization. Therefore, we reiterate our support for the French proposals as formulated in document S/1994/1279 and confirm the Polish delegation's readiness to take part in further discussions on the issue of the transparency of the work of the Security Council.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Poland for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Rowe (Australia): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of December.

Australia welcomes the convening of this meeting of the Security Council and the initiative taken by the Permanent Representative of France in submitting proposals for the convening of public meetings.

The convening of this meeting is evidence in itself that public meetings of the Council, in which Member States of this Organization can contribute their views, can and should be held in order to enable discussion and reflection by the Council and Member States on matters important to us all — particularly on matters concerning the maintenance of international peace and security.

We endorse the objectives of the proposal contained in the letter dated 9 November 1994 from the Permanent Representative of France to the Secretary-General (S/1994/1279). We welcome the recognition contained in that letter that increased reliance by the Council on public debate will enhance the Council's decision-making in formulating responses in connection with the maintenance of international peace and security. Convening public meetings of the Council is a step in the right direction in achieving this objective although we, like others who have spoken, fully recognize that more will need to be done to address the necessary reforms.

In recent years growing concern has been expressed about the need to improve the working methods and practices of the Council. This concern has been reflected in the consistent calls for improved means of communication and consultation between the Council and the overall membership of the United Nations.

We have been pleased to see that there have been instances where the Security Council has listened to the Member States and has sought itself to respond to calls for change. The procedure of convening meetings of troop-contributing countries, members of the Security Council and the Secretariat is the most recent positive example of this, and one which we welcomed in a statement to the Council.

The importance of public meetings of the Council has long been recognized under the provisional rules of procedure. With the unprecedented number of complex situations to which the Council is being called upon to respond, and the increasing frequency of its deliberations, we now find ourselves in times in which these procedures will be most valuable.

In our view, it is important that public meetings should be so structured as to provide a genuine basis for a two-way exchange between the Council and the Member States. Consideration by the Council of the perspectives of Member States, particularly those most affected by a situation, is a *sine qua non* for the deliberations of the Council.

Public meetings should not be used as a stale, uninformative, formalistic procedure devoid of real discussion. We do not see the public meetings as being merely another occasion for the delivery of set-piece statements by Member States or by members of the Council. The spirit of the Charter and the provisional rules of procedure envisage genuine discussion and a two-way flow, not just of views but of analysis, particularly in respect of States most affected by the decisions to be taken by the Council. In this spirit there will need to be greater degree of participation in the discussions and decisions of the Council by such States, be they troop contributors, States in the region of the conflict, or others.

In this context, it is important to remember that, according to Article 24 of the Charter, the Security Council acts on behalf of Member States. It makes sense, then, for the Council to be responsive to the views of Member States. Article 24 implies a two- way flow of information. More information should flow out of the Council to the wider membership on all aspects of its work. But there must also be a flow into the Council from the whole community it serves. Its role as an effective representative body demands at least this.

Therefore, while we welcome this initiative as a significant contribution to improving the working methods of the Council, we emphasize the importance we attach to continuing to address this question on an ongoing basis. For example, in addition to the public meetings identified in the French proposal, we may need to explore other, more flexible means for securing discussion and a level of participation of Member States especially affected by a situation under consideration by the Council, as envisaged under Article 31 of the Charter. Further, convening the kinds of public meetings enumerated in the French proposal cannot be a substitute for the continuing improvements in the consultations that are necessary between the Council and troop-contributing countries.

The calls for increased transparency are symptomatic of a deeper problem: the need to ensure that the Council has the full confidence, or, as the Permanent Representative of France described it, the full trust of the membership that it represents. This deeper concern is one that cannot be satisfactorily addressed just by increasing the number of public hearings. It can be addressed by ensuring that the expansion of the Council and its future composition reflects decision-making that is truly representative of the perspectives and interests of Member States.

Accordingly, we attach importance to continuing consideration of further reforms to the Council and to the Organization in order to ensure that the Council is more responsive, rather than reactive; that it develops the culture and methodology for identifying and responding to situations that have the potential to threaten international peace and security, before there is war or genocide or mass devastation — in short, means by which this Organization can develop a preventive capacity that draws the Council's attention to emerging global crises and threats, military and non-military.

The efforts of the Security Council and in particular of the French Government in taking this initiative deserve our appreciation. This has been a valuable debate and one which we see as contributing significantly to the increased effectiveness of the Organization.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Australia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Omar Sacirbey (Bosnia and Herzegovina): I should like to begin by associating my delegation with the congratulations that have been extended to you, Mr. President. We are certainly of the view that they are more than deserved.

The question of the working methods and procedures of the Security Council has affected, and still does directly affect, the situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Security Council has spent much time and energy, for which my delegation is thankful, on the situation in the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Consequently, my delegation has had a firsthand view of the shortcomings of the Council with respect to its working methods. From our perspective, the most notable of the shortcomings have been in the transparency, or lack thereof, of the deliberations, and the manner in which the Security Council keeps itself informed.

Transparency is the attribute whereby the Security Council is to keep the general membership informed, and whereby the Council is to meet one of the objectives of the Charter: "harmonizing the actions of nations". The absence of formal mechanisms to facilitate transparency means that transparency must be undertaken at an

informal and practically voluntary level. This transparency has not been forthcoming enough, and resolutions of the Council have not had the full benefit of the opinions and expertise of the interested Member States outside of the Council. This absence of non-Council input only compromises the work of the Council and leaves the impression that the Council is no longer a vehicle by which the general membership can express itself, but instead has become a vehicle driven by an elite few. The Council cannot afford to leave this impression if it is to meet the objective of "harmonizing actions of nations" as well as to fulfil the fundamental principle of equality among nations.

A case in point is the recent Security Council resolution 943 (1994), easing sanctions on Serbia and Montenegro. Late this summer, rumours were circulating among some Member States outside of the Council that such a resolution had been drafted. Later, rumour had it that just the opposite of that resolution had been drafted. The rumours continued and grew, with various spins on what type of resolution was, in fact, being drafted. This situation lasted for several weeks without any non-Council States having any idea of what was really taking place. Delegates following the situation in the former Yugoslavia had been reduced to gossip columnists watching the latest movements of their favorite celebrity. It was many weeks before initial drafts were circulated, and it is still doubtful whether resolution 943 (1994) reflects the views of the general membership.

And how is the Member State most directly affected by these deliberations supposed to react? Time and time again, my delegation and others must wait to see how the hundreds of thousands of civilians of our countries will be dealt with by the Security Council. It is not unlike the situation of the wife whose husband has been reported taken hostage by criminals, and is not informed on how the police intends to rescue her husband. Therefore, we would most enthusiastically welcome initiatives providing for open debates for all Members of this Organization, but it is important that interested Member States be allowed to make their input available, not as an afterthought to deliberations, but as a valuable resource to be utilized at the beginning of deliberations.

The Security Council has based its decisions solely on the information given to it by the Secretariat. This information has at times arrived too late, and at times has been either inconsistent or even suppressed. The case of Bosnia and Herzegovina again provides an example. The presidential statement adopted this past Tuesday was able to determine that an attack on Bangladeshi peace keepers was deliberate, yet was not able to specify who was responsible for the attack. We believe that the absurdity in this is self-evident.

Another case in point is Bihac. I should like to briefly quote from an Associated Press wire report dated 25 November:

> "A United Nations spokesman ... repeated assurances that rebel Serbs were respecting the Bihac zone, which is roughly six miles by five miles. He mentioned in passing, however, that a United Nations observation post had to be abandoned due to shell fire. Afterward, reporters with access to United Nations maps discovered the post was inside the safe zone."

This is clearly a case of suppression of information and tends to reek of independent agendas, apart from the interests that are to be pursued in accordance with the Charter. We do not know yet where this decision was made. If the Council decides to continue to rely on information solely from the Secretariat, than the Secretariat must be held to the highest standards of truth, and appropriate action should be taken in response to those who deprive the Security Council, and, in effect, the entire membership of the United Nations, of the truth. Anything less is an affront to all Member States, which depend upon the integrity of the Organization for their well-being and protection. In our case, this suppression has been the vehicle for our pursuit of even-handedness. While many can debate on whether or not the concept of even-handedness should be practised on absolute terms, I believe that we can all agree that even-handedness should not be pursued at the expense of the truth.

In the meantime, we realize that we have only the Security Council upon which to rely, and we will continue to work with present and incoming members in this regard. We will continue to provide the Council and non-Council States with the benefit of our experience, particularly in reference to transparency and provision of information. We look forward to these issues and shortcomings of the Council being addressed, and we would like to extend our most sincere appreciation to the Government and the delegation of France for taking upon themselves this very great responsibility which, we believe, has the potential to be implemented and can only improve the Security Council.

The President (*interpretation from French*): I thank the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina for the kind words he addressed to me.

The President *(interpretation from French):* To conclude the present stage of the consideration of the item on the agenda, I have been authorized, following consultations among members of the Security Council, to make the following statement on behalf of the Council.

"The Security Council has heard the views of members of the Council and many other United Nations Member States on the item under discussion. These have revealed widespread support for greater recourse to open meetings of the Council and a clear will on the part of the members of the Council to respond to this. It is therefore the intention of the Council, as part of its efforts to improve the flow of information and the exchange of ideas between members of the Council and other United Nations Member States, that there should be an increased recourse to open meetings, in particular at an early stage in its consideration of a subject. The Council will decide on a case-by-case basis when to schedule public meetings of this sort. The Security Council's Working Group on Documentation and Procedure will examine further this question in the light of the views expressed and submit a report without delay.

"The Security Council will consider further this question."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/1994/81.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 7.20 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3484

Security Council

Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3484th Meeting

Wednesday, 21 December 1994, 4 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Valle
	China	Mr. Zhang Yan
	Czech Republic	Mr. Rovensky
	Djibouti	Mr. Dorani
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	New Zealand	Mr. Keating
	Nigeria	Mr. Ayewah
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Sidorov
	Spain	Mr. Laclaustra
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Cyprus

Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/1994/1407 and Add.1)

94-87512 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Cyprus

Report of the Secretary General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus (S/1994/1407 and Add.1)

The President (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Cyprus, document S/1994/1407 and Add.1. Members of the Council also have before them document S/1994/1433, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution (S/1994/1433) before it. If I hear no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour:

Argentina, Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Djibouti, France, New Zealand, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

The President *(interpretation from French)*: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 969 (1994).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.25 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.3485

Security Council
Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3485th Meeting
Thursday, 22 December 1994, 10.30 a.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Bakuramutsa	(Rwanda)
Members:	Argentina	Mrs. Cañas
	Brazil	Mr. Valle
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Sporýš
	Djibouti	Mr. Dorani
	France	Mr. Ladsous
	New Zealand	Mr. van Bohemen
	Nigeria	Mr. Uhomoibhi
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Fedotov
	Spain	Mr. Laclaustra
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay
	United States of America	Mr. Inderfurth

Agenda

The situation in Burundi

94-87518 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Burundi

The President (*interpretation from French*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Following consultations among members of the Security Council, I have been authorized to make the following statement on behalf of the Council:

"The Security Council continues to follow closely developments in Burundi. It is concerned about the escalation of violence in Burundi, both in Bujumbura and in the countryside, which threatens to further destabilize an already fragile situation and could endanger the stability of the subregion. It calls on all those concerned to refrain from violence. It supports fully the efforts of the Burundi authorities in seeking to ensure that those committing or inciting the commitment of acts of violence are held accountable for their actions and that the militias that are still operating both in Bujumbura and in the countryside are disarmed.

"The Security Council encourages the Government, the National Assembly, the political parties and all others concerned in Burundi, and in particular the army, to respect and give support to the Convention of Government of 10 September 1994 and thus avoid jeopardizing the delicate balance and relative stability in place since its implementation.

"The Security Council welcomes the continuing efforts being made to bring about further political progress in Burundi and underlines the importance of continuing to resolve all outstanding issues through dialogue on the basis of the agreements reached thus far by the political parties. It urges all sides to reject confrontational tactics, violence or extremism, and to work towards compromise and conciliation in a spirit of national unity which transcends ethnic origins.

"The Security Council commends the Secretary-General for his efforts and expresses appreciation for the work done by his Special Representative, and the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the High Commissioner for Refugees and the High Commissioner for Human Rights, for their efforts within their respective competences, to contribute to the resolution of the problems of Burundi.

"The Security Council requests the Secretary-General to keep it fully informed of developments in Burundi.

"The Council will remain actively seized of the matter."

This statement will be issued as a document of the Security Council under the symbol S/PRST/1994/82.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.